

## **Historic, Archive Document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



# TOBACCO ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

---



HEARING  
BEFORE THE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TOBACCO  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H. R. 11043, H. R. 11058, H. R. 11059, H. R. 11060,  
H. R. 11061, H. R. 11062, H. R. 11063, H. R. 11064,  
and H. R. 11065

---

MARCH 5, 1958

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture

Serial UU



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1958

## COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

HAROLD D. COOLEY, North Carolina, *Chairman*

WILLIAM S. HILL, Colorado, *ex officio member of all subcommittees*

W. R. POAGE, Texas  
GEORGE M. GRANT, Alabama  
E. C. GATHINGS, Arkansas  
JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina  
THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Mississippi  
CARL ALBERT, Oklahoma  
WATKINS M. ABBITT, Virginia  
JAMES G. POLK, Ohio  
CLARK W. THOMPSON, Texas  
PAUL C. JONES, Missouri  
JOHN C. WATTS, Kentucky  
HARLAN HAGEN, California  
LESTER R. JOHNSON, Wisconsin  
VICTOR L. ANFUSO, New York  
ROSS BASS, Tennessee  
COYA KNUTSON, Minnesota  
W. PAT JENNINGS, Virginia  
D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS, Florida

CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa  
SID SIMPSON, Illinois  
PAUL B. DAGUE, Pennsylvania  
RALPH HARVEY, Indiana  
PAGE BELCHER, Oklahoma  
CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, Maine  
WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS, New York  
ROBERT D. HARRISON, Nebraska  
HENRY ALDOUS DIXON, Utah  
WINT SMITH, Kansas  
OTTO KRUEGER, North Dakota  
CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California  
DONALD E. TEWES, Wisconsin  
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota

### DELEGATES

E. L. BARTLETT, Alaska  
JOHN A. BURNS, Hawaii

### RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

A. FERNÓS-ISERN, Puerto Rico

Mrs. MABEL C. DOWNEY, *Clerk*  
HYDE H. MURRAY, *Assistant Clerk*  
JOHN J. HEIMBURGER, *Counsel*  
FRANCIS M. LEMAY, *Consultant*

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON TOBACCO

WATKINS M. ABBITT, Virginia, *Chairman*

JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina  
JAMES G. POLK, Ohio  
JOHN C. WATTS, Kentucky  
ROSS BASS, Tennessee  
W. PAT JENNINGS, Virginia  
D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS, Florida

PAUL B. DAGUE, Pennsylvania  
SID SIMPSON, Illinois  
CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, Maine  
DONALD E. TEWES, Wisconsin  
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota

## CONTENTS

---

	Page
H. R. 11043. A bill to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments.....	1
H. R. 11058. A bill to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments.....	1
H. R. 11059. A bill to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments.....	2
H. R. 11060. A bill to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments.....	2
H. R. 11061. A bill to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments.....	2
H. R. 11062. A bill to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments.....	2
H. R. 11063. A bill to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments.....	3
H. R. 11064. A bill to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments.....	3
H. R. 11065. A bill to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments.....	3
Statement of—	
Chelf, Hon. Frank, a Representative in Congress of the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Kentucky.....	13
Perkins, Hon. Carl D., a Representative in Congress from the Seventh Congressional District of the State of Kentucky.....	21
Spence, Hon. Brent, a Representative in Congress of the Fifth District of the State of Kentucky.....	15
Williams, Joe R., Director, Tobacco Division; accompanied by Jeff D. Johnson, Jr., Deputy Director; Frank R. Ellis, Chief of the Price Support Section; and Joseph J. Todd, Marketing Quota Section, Tobacco Division; Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture.....	3

# CONTENTS

Page	Chapter
1	Introduction
15	Chapter I
35	Chapter II
55	Chapter III
75	Chapter IV
95	Chapter V
115	Chapter VI
135	Chapter VII
155	Chapter VIII
175	Chapter IX
195	Chapter X
215	Chapter XI
235	Chapter XII
255	Chapter XIII
275	Chapter XIV
295	Chapter XV
315	Chapter XVI
335	Chapter XVII
355	Chapter XVIII
375	Chapter XIX
395	Chapter XX
415	Chapter XXI
435	Chapter XXII
455	Chapter XXIII
475	Chapter XXIV
495	Chapter XXV
515	Chapter XXVI
535	Chapter XXVII
555	Chapter XXVIII
575	Chapter XXIX
595	Chapter XXX

# TOBACCO ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

---

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 5, 1958

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TOBACCO OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a. m., in room 1310, New House Office Building, Hon. Watkins M. Abbitt (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Abbitt, Watts, Bass, Jennings, Matthews, and McIntire.

Also present: Representatives Spence and Chelf; Mabel C. Downey, clerk.

Mr. ABBITT. The meeting will come to order.

I note we have some of the distinguished officials from the Department of Agriculture, Tobacco Division, present, and we will be glad to hear from them.

We have under consideration H. R. 11043, H. R. 11048, H. R. 11059, H. R. 11060, H. R. 11061, H. R. 11062, H. R. 11063, H. R. 10064, and H. R. 11065.

(The bills are as follows:)

[H. R. 11043, 78th Cong., 2d sess.]

**A BILL To amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments**

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If in any calendar year more than one crop of tobacco is grown from (1) the same tobacco plants or (2) different tobacco plants, and is harvested for marketing from the same acreage of a farm, the acreage allotment next established for such farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco has been so grown and harvested."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective beginning with the 1958 crop of tobacco.

[H. R. 11058, 85th Cong., 2d sess.]

**A BILL To amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments**

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If in any calendar year more than one crop of tobacco is grown from (1) the same tobacco plants or (2) different tobacco plants, and is harvested for marketing from the same acreage of a farm, the acreage allotment next established for such farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco has been so grown and harvested."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective beginning with the 1958 crop of tobacco.



[H. R. 11059, 85th Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If in any calendar year more than one crop of tobacco is grown from (1) the same tobacco plants or (2) different tobacco plants, and is harvested for marketing from the same acreage of a farm, the acreage allotment next established for such farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco has been so grown and harvested."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective beginning with the 1958 crop of tobacco.

---

[H. R. 11060, 85th Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If in any calendar year more than one crop of tobacco is grown from (1) the same tobacco plants or (2) different tobacco plants, and is harvested for marketing from the same acreage of a farm, the acreage allotment next established for such farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco has been so grown and harvested."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective beginning with the 1958 crop of tobacco.

---

[H. R. 11061, 85th Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If in any calendar year more than one crop of tobacco is grown from (1) the same tobacco plants or (2) different tobacco plants, and is harvested for marketing from the same acreage of a farm, the acreage allotment next established for such farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco has been so grown and harvested."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective beginning with the 1958 crop of tobacco.

---

[H. R. 11062, 85th Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If in any calendar year more than one crop of tobacco is grown from (1) the same tobacco plants, or (2) different tobacco plants, and is harvested for marketing from the same acreage of a farm, the acreage allotment next established for such farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco has been so grown and harvested."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective beginning with the 1958 crop of tobacco.



[H. R. 11063, 85th Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If in any calendar year more than one crop of tobacco is grown from (1) the same tobacco plants or (2) different tobacco plants, and is harvested for marketing from the same acreage of a farm, the acreage allotment next established for such farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco has been so grown and harvested."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective beginning with the 1958 crop of tobacco.

[H. R. 11064, 85th Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If in any calendar year more than one crop of tobacco is grown from (1) the same tobacco plants or (2) different tobacco plants, and is harvested for marketing from the same acreage of a farm, the acreage allotment next established for such farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco has been so grown and harvested."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective beginning with the 1958 crop of tobacco.

[H. R. 11065, 85th Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If in any calendar year more than one crop of tobacco is grown from (1) the same tobacco plants or (2) different tobacco plants, and is harvested for marketing from the same acreage of a farm, the acreage allotment next established for such farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco has been so grown and harvested."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective beginning with the 1958 crop of tobacco.

Mr. ABBITT. They deal with the so-called sucker tobacco problem. I think we would like to hear from Mr. Joe Williams.

**STATEMENT OF JOE R. WILLIAMS, DIRECTOR, TOBACCO DIVISION;  
ACCOMPANIED BY JEFF. D. JOHNSON, Jr., DEPUTY DIRECTOR,  
FRANK R. ELLIS, CHIEF OF THE PRICE SUPPORT SECTION, AND  
JOSEPH J. TODD, MARKETING QUOTA SECTION, TOBACCO DIVI-  
SION, COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF  
AGRICULTURE**

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am Joe R. Williams, Director of the Tobacco Division, CSS. I have with me this morning Mr. Jeff D. Johnson, Jr., Deputy Director of the Tobacco Division; Mr. Frank R. Ellis, Chief of the Price Support Section; and Mr. Joseph J. Todd, head of the Marketing Quota Section of the Tobacco Division, CSS.

Any one of us will be glad to answer any questions that any member of the committee has to ask.

I would like to apologize at this time to the committee for my inability, due to the short period of time to get an official Department report on these series of bills that we have before the committee today. I will comment, if the committee wants me to, on what these bills intend to do, and how it affects us in the administration of the program.

Mr. ABBITT. My understanding is that they are all identical and similar bills introduced by these people who are vitally interested in the subject. And I wish you would just briefly tell us what to do and what your problem is, if it can be solved by these bills.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They are identical bills, and I presume that the Department in the official report will give an identical report to each of these bills.

These bills deal with second-crop tobacco growing on the same allotment. It applies to all types of tobacco, and in 1957 for the first time the production of suckers, or a second-crop tobacco, on the allotment became a serious problem.

We have had through the years exceptions where you had particularly early crops, such as 1957, and with a late fall season farmers could produce a second crop of tobacco. But it has been very rare. But with irrigation and in cases where you have an extreme early spring and a late fall, it has reached such proportion that in 1957 it became quite a serious problem.

We had an overall meeting of the tobacco leaders in Lexington, Ky., early this year, at which time there was about 100 persons representing all segments of the tobacco industry present.

We were unable to get exact figures as to the amount of suckers produced in 1957. However, the estimates ran anywhere from 5 million up to 15 million pounds.

This has two serious implications in the administration of our program: In the first place, we make an acre allotment of tobacco. Whether or not it was the intent of Congress under the present law to include more than 1 crop of tobacco on that 1-acre allotment is not clear. We did look into it from the administrative standpoint to determine whether or not we could limit a farmer to production of 1 crop in any 1 year by administrative ruling. Our legislative counsel for the Department of Agriculture advised us under present legislation that it was doubtful whether or not we could stop second-crop production by administrative action. Therefore, in order to prevent a farmer from producing two crops, a sucker crop after raising a regular crop, it appears we will have to have legislation.

Suckers, in our opinion, was a problem in 1957, and as farmers continue to increase irrigation it will be a more serious problem.

If we had 12 to 15 million pounds of suckers last year, that is the equivalent to about 2 percent of the production. So if we multiply that by 2 years, that is 4 percent. In the absence of the production of these suckers it would mean that we could give to the farmers an overall increase of approximately 4 percent in their allotment and let all of them produce more tobacco.

The thing that I think is more important even than that is the fact that American tobacco in all types is sold primarily in the world market due to superior quality from the flavor and aroma standpoint.



These suckers that are produced as a second crop usually with heavier fertilizer is definitely inferior tobacco from the flavor and aroma standpoint, as compared with the original crop of burley tobacco.

Suckers will sell cheaper on the market. And even though the farmers appreciate the additional income, when this sucker tobacco goes into the world market and sells as standard burley tobacco, I feel that it will have an adverse effect on the future of our export trade, not only on burley tobacco but on other tobacco.

We will get you, as soon as possible, the official report of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Williams, let me ask you this just for the record: The problem is almost entirely caused by the second crop tobacco on the same planting?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true.

Mr. ABBITT. What we call "sucker tobacco?"

Mr. WILLIAMS. Sucker tobacco.

Mr. ABBITT. By harvesting the second crop from the same plant?

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I interpret this bill, or these bills——

Mr. ABBITT. It covers all of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The real problem is that, let me say this, in case we do have some instances where there may be by the 1st of June a hailstorm and it cuts your original plant and you grow your first crop from the sucker, this legislation does not attempt to prevent that. But it does attempt to prevent the harvesting of a complete crop of tobacco, and applying fertilizer and water to suckers and then produce the second crop and sell it on the same allotment.

Mr. ABBITT. In other words, you are trying to prevent the harvesting of two crops of tobacco from the same plant?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is right. That is the purpose as we interpret it of all of this legislation.

Mr. ABBITT. And in your opinion this bill would not cover a situation where hail, for instance, destroys some flue tobacco early in the year and a crop of sucker is harvested?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, sir; until they harvest two crops in the same year, it is not covered by this legislation.

Mr. ABBITT. They harvest two crops?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The actual harvesting of two complete crops.

Mr. ABBITT. Where was the problem, and what type of tobacco was the problem in, in 1957?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Primarily in burley tobacco. The Burley Belt had in many areas an extremely early spring, followed by an extremely late fall. They cut some tobacco in August, and farmers could not stand it when those pretty suckers grew up and produced five or six hundred pounds of tobacco, so they harvested them.

Mr. ABBITT. Have you ever had that problem with flue-cured tobacco further south, in the Carolinas or Georgia?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. We haven't due to the fact we harvest our tobacco differently. We prime it over a period of 7 or 8 weeks. And by the time we get our original crop off, the weather is so hot it is almost impossible to produce a completely new crop. However, that is covered in this legislation due to the fact that it will prevent it in all types.

Mr. ABBITT. In the flue-cured they do not harvest their tobacco by cutting the stalk?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, sir.

Mr. ABBITT. But by putting the bottom leaves on up to the top, for 3 or 4 weeks. Therefore, they are not as susceptible of producing suckers later on as you would have in the burley or dark tobaccos.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think with irrigation and heavy fertilization it is a problem that will face all types of tobacco. It just happened to lead off in burley. But I think in certain areas of the flue-cured areas where we have good irrigation, our farmers will soon learn what they are doing in the burley and it will be a serious problem there.

Mr. ABBITT. Your experience tells you that the second crop or sucker crop is definitely a much inferior tobacco than the first crop?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Taken as a whole, yes. There may be some instances where the first crop would be inferior, but as a whole, the second crop is far inferior to the original.

Mr. ABBITT. You say in 1957 you had approximately 15 million pounds?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That was the estimate of the leadership that we had at the Lexington meeting.

Mr. ABBITT. That was in burley?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That was in burley tobacco alone. We took about 2 percent in the soil bank and the estimate as I detected down there, it was probably offset with suckers, what we took in the soil bank.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Williams, I believe the practice became more pronounced this year than it did in times in the past; did it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir; there were more suckers harvested this year than at any former year that I know anything about.

Mr. WATTS. I think you probably agree with me that if the practice were permitted to continue that it will grow year by year?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir; I think so.

Mr. WATTS. In other words, if farmer A saw farmer B harvesting a crop of suckers getting four or five hundred dollars an acre out of it, he will plan on doing the same thing next year?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that is only reasonable. You can sell it for 60 cents a pound and then harvest five or six hundred additional pounds and you can get 37. I think there is enough incentive that farmers will do it.

Mr. WATTS. In the long run, it will have a tendency, will it not, to cheapen and lower the grade of all types of tobaccos because farmers would be prone to cut the first crop of little bit earlier, in order to get the second crop started growing?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If you were going to willfully try to grow two crops it would have that effect. That is very important. It is important on every type of tobacco that you let it stay on the land long enough to properly ripen.

Mr. WATTS. And this year, there were some farmers who did do it intentionally, as you said, and some who took advantage of a long fall season?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WATTS. And cut the sucker crop?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. WATTS. Those that did it intentionally, as I understand it, cut the crop a little early, went in and recultivated the land, refertilized it, irrigated it, and produced a pretty good second crop of suckers?



Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that several of them produced six and seven hundred pounds.

Mr. WATTS. Per acre?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. WATTS. And sell it for around 45 and 60 cents a pound?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Some sold up in the 50 cents. I would say that probably it averaged 30 cents.

Mr. WATTS. And it is your opinion that if this practice is permitted to continue to be indulged in and becomes widespread as some of us are fearful that it will, that the ultimate result is that it probably will be the destruction of the tobacco program; will it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it would have a harmful effect on the tobacco program because I think it is encouraging the production of an inferior type of tobacco at the expense of those growers that are producing the original crop.

Mr. WATTS. Not only that, but it is putting a premium on quantity, for those who are wealthy enough to be able to provide irrigating systems.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not only wealthy enough but a lot of small farmers adjacent to a stream, where they rig up a very cheap irrigation system can do so, also; and then in some sections they will take a dipper out and irrigate it.

Mr. WATTS. I know we have some large farmers in my section that built irrigation systems; they are irrigating corn and pasture. If they are permitted to cut their crop early and turn the full force of their irrigation on they could raise a second crop every year, could they not, sir?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Where you have irrigation, I think in most years you could produce a pretty good sucker crop.

Mr. WATTS. You think then that the practice, if permitted to continue, would have 2 detrimental effects; 1 is that it would add to our supply of tobacco and prevent the general farmer who is not engaged in this practice from raising more tobacco than he might be entitled to, if the sucker tobacco was kept off the market?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. WATTS. And furthermore you think the inferior quality might get into European countries and be labeled "burley tobacco," and give our burley tobacco a black eye in export trade?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true, because it does not have the quality of the original burley tobacco.

Mr. WATTS. And, personally, I feel like it was never the intention of the law that any farmer who has an allotted crop be permitted to raise 2 crops on the same land in any 1 year. My good friend Billy Matthews down there, he might raise four crops of tobacco.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I just came in, but I really am shocked to think this is happening.

Mr. WATTS. It is happening and it will spread into flue-cured unless we nip it in the bud by the legislation introduced. I reckon the reason that the Department cannot give us an exact figure as to the amount that was sold is that it was difficult to distinguish suckers from the other; is that right?

Mr. WILLIAMS. There was no attempt here to segregate it officially, really.

Mr. WATTS. But your estimate runs anywhere from, you say, 5 million to 15 million pounds?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true, and I would say a happy medium would be between the 5 million and 15 million which would probably be right; 10 or 11 million pounds.

Mr. WATTS. Your opinion is that if it is not stopped that the practice will grow from year to year?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think so.

Mr. WATTS. While I could not get you exactly to say that, I think we can all realize that if it is not stopped it will do serious damage.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think if we produce 10 million pounds of suckers, I will say that it is an inferior tobacco as compared with the other 480 million pounds that you produce. And 10 million or 15 million pounds a year, over 1 or 2 or 3 years will prevent an increase of 5 per cent to all of the farmers on their original allotment.

Mr. WATTS. These bills, as drawn, would not only prevent the recultivation of the original stalk where the sucker comes from, but would prevent the planting of a second crop—

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is right.

Mr. WATTS. For harvest?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. WATTS. I think you made it very clear to Congressman Abbitt that if a man ran into a catastrophe with his crop, like hail or flood or anything like that, he could under this law replant it, and harvest, so long as he did not harvest 2 crops off the same tract of land in any 1 year?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true. If a man has a disaster, he could go ahead and grow a crop from suckers. The thing that catches him under this legislation would be harvesting a complete crop and then a second crop of suckers or harvesting two crops off the same allotment in the same year.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Chairman, before I conclude, Congressman Gregory called me this morning and asked me to express to the committee his deep interest in this legislation. He is the author of one of the bills. He said that before his committee this morning that he had tobacco people from Kentucky, who were talking about the Reciprocal Trade Act, it was impossible for him to be here, but he wanted to be on record as heartily endorsing the legislation.

Congressman Perkins made the same request. He may later want to file a statement.

My good friend Chelf is here whom I assume will want to make a statement later on.

Mr. ABBITT. We are glad to have those remarks. They have been most helpful to this committee.

Are there any further questions that you want to direct to the witness?

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one or two questions.

Has such legislation to your knowledge ever been introduced before, Mr. Williams?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not believe we have had the problem in this proportion before.

Mr. BASS. This growing of burley and the operation of the burley program is not anything new at all. It has been in existence for several years. Why has it not been brought to our attention before? What makes it serious now, and why has it not been here before?



Mr. WILLIAMS. I think two things have made it serious at the present time.

First, the irrigation which makes it possible, and, second, is the 60-cent-a-pound tobacco.

Mr. BASS. Irrigation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Irrigation.

Mr. BASS. Which is not completely new at all; we have had it for several years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; you have had it for several years. It has become pretty well universal where a man can finance it or where water is available; irrigation is the coming thing.

Mr. BASS. Is the fact that the type of tobacco that they grow as a second crop more usable now than it has been before; is that a factor?

Mr. WILLIAMS. More usable?

Mr. BASS. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, in years gone by it has had very little value, maybe 3 or 4 cents a pound.

Mr. BASS. Actually, it is more usable the way they are using burley today—it is more usable than it was before; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is an attempt to find some tobacco that they can sell strictly on a price basis rather than quality. Competition has forced it up to where it is 30 and 40 cents a pound now.

Mr. BASS. What localities are more guilty than others in this practice?

Mr. WILLIAMS. All of them. I doubt whether it is confined.

Mr. BASS. Is weather a factor?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Weather is a factor. I mean where you would have 2 or 3 weeks difference in the season.

Mr. BASS. Even 10 days would make a difference?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ten days would make possibly 100 pounds difference in the second crop in harvesting. I think it is something that will go all the way from Virginia right on through Kentucky, that all of them will grow it where the possibility is. I don't think it will show up in one State out of proportion to the other.

Mr. Johnson is from Tennessee and is more familiar with the problem so far as that State is concerned than I am.

Mr. BASS. How did you get your estimates of 5 million to 15 million pounds?

Mr. WILLIAMS. At the quota meeting we had in Lexington, Ky., where we had the 5 State leaders in, about 100 of them, and this question was raised, and the estimate was made there. The least estimate made was 5 million and the highest was about 15 million.

Mr. BASS. As you know, in the district that I represent we raise quite a bit of burley. I saw second crops being cut and taken to the barn, but I would say that it was a very, very, very small percentage of the total crop of tobacco in my area. And in previous years it was much smaller because I think we had an extremely late fall this year or late winter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BASS. I do not know whether we have had enough general information from the people in the field on this legislation. What do you think about it, as to the growers' position?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, of course, as I say, this legislation was introduced last week and even the Department has not had sufficient time

for its recommendation to go through the policy staff committee. As I appraise the thinking of the leadership in every State, I think all of them recognize the problem that we have here.

Mr. BASS. I agree with you.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You might want to check it with your farm organizations.

Mr. BASS. I think that it is a problem and we should have a policy on it. The thing that strikes me is this: We encourage, and have over a period of years, our farmers to produce all that they can on the land that they have and to produce available commodities. And then this legislation is one more method of restricting an individual farmer, restricting his income.

The end may be good. I am not saying that it is not. I am not saying that one farmer should be allowed to produce two crops of tobacco and another farmer is not in a position to do so. But at the same time, it is further reducing somebody's income on the farm. And I don't know whose it might be—my neighbor's, or it might be your neighbor's or somebody in Kentucky or somebody in Tennessee or Virginia, but it seems to me that so many times when we come in here that the legislation that we are considering is legislation which further reduces the possibility of somebody making some dollars off of the land that they are farming and are operating. That is the thing that enters my mind.

I do not believe that any one man should be given a privilege of doing something that all of the people are not allowed to do, in our program; but, Mr. Chairman, I think this is legislation that before I would be able to make a final conclusion on it I believe I would rather have time to talk with the people in the field, with the farmers, and to get some reaction because it is just this, I have made up my mind to quit voting for anything that cuts income.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think my remarks might come in well here because I think I disagree with my good friend, Congressman Bass. I have been on this committee as my colleagues know only a little over 3 years and there is no doubt that all of us want all of our farmers to make all of the money that they can, and to produce all that they can to make that money. I don't think there is any question at all about it. But the problem that we are faced with as I see it from year to year is to get a program that will be fair to the great majority of the farmers insofar as we can with the legislative handicaps that we have in getting any kind of farm legislation. I am concerned in this matter with the overall tobacco program. We all know the problems. The Secretary of Agriculture has suggested that the price support program be flexible from 60 to 90 percent. I would like to ask several questions that would give me more information.

In the first place, is the quality of this tobacco that would be produced as a second crop inferior to the quality that would be produced on just the one crop?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In most instances, yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What effect would a continuation of this practice have on the overall tobacco program and, particularly, I have in mind the reduction of the allotment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, any amount that is grown in a second crop of tobacco enters into the supply of it. And then the Secretary in proclaiming the next year's program must take into account the



supply level. So this 10 or 5 or 15 million it enters into the supply level and enters into the calculation of the 1959 quota.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In your opinion if this practice is continued it might result in a reduction in acreage allotments and, of course, it would be in the flue-cured belts if the practice is pursued there?

Mr. WILLIAMS. They had a disappearance on burley tobacco this year of about 510 million pounds. They had a production of 490 million pounds. Had it not been for these suckers the production would have been 480 million pounds which would have meant that the total production would have been 30 million pounds under disappearance.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And then in other words, the picture might be a little bit brighter for an increase in allotment if it had not been for this particular production about which we are talking?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. Two percent of the total is suckers and when you eliminate that 2 percent it will mean ultimately whatever that production is can go to all of the growers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Let me ask you this question. Would the production of these suckers have any effect on the markets to the extent that perhaps the price of burley might be lowered as a result of this production if this practice continues?

Mr. WILLIAMS. At the present time, I don't think it would, due to the fact that the supply level now is below your disappearance. And the farmers have made adjustments to get the supply in line with demand. But if you let that supply get out of line and let the production get up equally, actually in that way it would have an effect. That is true, the overall average goes into the calculation of your price supports. So that it would. Fourteen million pounds of tobacco could, or 10 million at 30 cents, goes into the overall average of 480 million at 60 cents a pound. So it would have an effect.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It would have an effect?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It looks to me like a bad effect.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Specifically, as you know—and I always like to take the occasion to thank Mr. Williams for his interest in this program and especially in my district—as you know we have flue-cured tobacco. We don't have a great amount of it compared to the great State of North Carolina, but it is of tremendous value, as you know. If my flue-cured tobacco farmers find out that burley producers are producing two crops a year, do you have a feeling that they might start that same practice in the flue-cured area in north Florida?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, not only north Florida but all the way up the coast.

Mr. BASS. Will you yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS. You are familiar with the method of harvesting flue-cured tobacco, and methods of growing, and so forth. Would it not be almost impossible to raise two crops of flue-cured tobacco under the same circumstances?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; it would not for the simple reason that in certain sections they have proceeded to harvest and by June 10 they have completed it.

Mr. BASS. But now, would it not be almost necessary in such a case, though, to plant 2 crops instead of growing 2 crops of suckers?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true, under the present law you can do that.

Mr. WATTS. You can do that under the present law?

Mr. BASS. I realize that; but in any of the flue-cured areas would it be possible to completely harvest one crop and then set another crop?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you give me back my time?

Mr. BASS. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to make this observation, that this has been a very unusual winter in Florida. I would like to say to my distinguished friend from Tennessee, in my opinion, you, certainly, could grow two crops.

Sometimes my friends doubt the fact that flue-cured tobacco in Florida is set the latter part of February. That is very common. This year we had difficulty getting plants, but coming back to my question, is it not your opinion that we could actually grow and harvest 2 crops in my section of the flue-cured area in 1 year?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir. You could set it out and produce a crop in 72 days. You get through down there June 15, and you could set another crop there easily. The same thing applies right on through the Carolinas.

Mr. ABBITT. Yes; and how about Virginia?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not want to take the time of the committee to say anything further. I am very much in favor of doing anything that will make this tobacco program a little better and to give all of the people who participate in it on the basis of good faith a better chance to participate in it to the maximum degree. At this stage of the game I think it is very well to do so.

Mr. ABBITT. Thank you very much.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. WATTS. May I note for the record that Mr. Chelf is here. He wants to make a statement as soon as he can.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman. I am going to make a short statement if I may be permitted to do so.

Mr. ABBITT. Congressman Chelf, we are delighted to have you here. You have always been of tremendous help to this committee. You have been so interested in all phases of our tobacco program and we appreciate your coming around here today to give us the benefit of your knowledge and experience in this matter.

Mr. WATTS. May I interrupt there and comment and say that I thoroughly agree with the chairman. Mr. Chelf has stood shoulder to shoulder with the rest of us from Kentucky and other tobacco States in a determined effort to provide the best tobacco program that can be provided for the farmers of the country.

Mr. Spence has done the same thing. And I think I can compliment the entire tobacco delegation from whatever State they might come, that they have always worked for what is known as a better tobacco program, and taking a real good attitude toward it. And I feel very proud that I am a member of the group known as the "tobacco group of the House."



STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK CHELF, A REPRESENTATIVE IN  
CONGRESS OF THE FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF  
THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, you are very kind, you and Mr. Watts and my other colleagues.

You know we folks who are not officially members of your great Agricultural Committee are indebted to you good people, and I am sincere about this, for your great consideration for those of us who represent tobacco areas who are not members of the Agricultural Committee, to permit us to come in here and to participate. I mean it is really wonderful. And we not only enjoy being associated with you, but to be able to contribute what good we may to this fine program that we have now and have had in the past.

Mr. Chairman, my interest in this particular piece of legislation is very deep because I think that the gentlemen here who represent the Department of Agriculture will bear me out when I say to you quite frankly that the great congressional district that Mr. Watts, my colleague, has the honor to represent, which covers the famous blue-grass section of Kentucky, and my great district, the fourth, which is contiguous and adjoining it, the 2 of us together raise approximately 75 percent of the total burley crop of Kentucky, which in turn produces, I think, in the neighborhood of around 67 to 68 percent of the total burley crop of the world. And so, therefore, we have a vital stake in this thing.

For that reason I was delighted to join with my colleague, Mr. Watts, and others in this move here to stop an insidious thing that may like a rat gnaw its way through our entire program. That is exactly what this thing will do if we permit it to go on. It is only 5 million to 15 million pounds now. I can envision it will not be too long until the word gets around, Joe is raising and getting away with it, then Jack will do it next door and then down the line, the road it goes and county after county and the first thing you know, we haven't any program.

I appreciate your courtesy in letting us come here, and to be heard.

I will make a little formal statement on this in a few moments, if I will be permitted to do so. But I would like to ask Mr. Williams for the sake of the record: Has there been any check as to the nicotine content on this sucker tobacco? I am told that the nicotine content in the sucker tobacco is much higher than the normal.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There has been. One company made a test.

Mr. ELLIS. We have been informally furnished by some of the manufacturers' chemical analyses of the sucker samples that they have taken, their own results. And the suckers are distinctively different in their chemical constituents. To single out any one element such as the alkaloids, would oversimplify the question of the significant chemical difference between the second-crop tobaccos and the first-crop tobaccos.

Mr. CHELF. Thank you.

Mr. Williams, do I understand that the Department feels that under existing law they cannot cope with this thing, in other words, you must necessarily have this legislation in order to stop this second growth crop?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me say it this way: The entire Kentucky delegation, senatorial delegation and the House, most of them have requested that we meet this problem administratively.

At the request of these gentlemen we went to our attorneys, and they turned it down under administrative regulations. We notified these gentlemen that we could not handle it from the administrative standpoint. As the result of that, these bills were introduced.

Mr. CHELF. In other words, you feel that it is a must that this legislation be enacted into law, if we are going to cope with this situation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me get back to this. The Department has not taken any position, but under the present—under present law as our attorneys interpret it, we have no way that we can deal with the problem.

Mr. CHELF. There isn't any doubt if this thing is allowed to grow and expand and develop but that it will eventually destroy our entire tobacco program? Is that a fair statement? It is allowed to go on and on and on unchecked?

Mr. WILLIAMS. My personal opinion is that it would be detrimental to the future of the program. That is not the Department's position, but my personal position is that every pound of suckers that enters into trade is harmful to the overall burley program.

Mr. CHELF. The more buildup we have of our so-called supplies, the more trouble we find ourselves in.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well not only the supplies but if the quality were the same it would not be as bad, but you are substituting an inferior quality for something superior upon which our foreign trade is really built.

Mr. CHELF. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, in order to conserve time may I be permitted to insert this in the record?

Mr. ABBITT. Yes. Put it in the record as though read.

Mr. CHELF. My name is Frank Chelf, representing the Fourth Congressional District of Kentucky. I appear here today in the interest of my bill, H. R. 11063, and all similar bills which prevent the sale of what is known as "sucker" tobacco.

Frankly, since my colleague, the Honorable John Watts of the Sixth District, introduced the first bill on this subject, I feel that his bill should be given priority in your deliberations.

While the sale of "sucker" tobacco is not a common practice, nevertheless, there has been a marked increase in the sale of "sucker" tobacco within the past few years. Its "weight" and its influence has been felt on the market. Due to the industry's great use, at the present time, of a lower type of tobacco—used with filter cigarettes—"sucker" tobacco, therefore, has had a ready market.

As a result, this tends to overstock the tobacco market and harms the sale of higher-quality tobacco which, in the final analysis, results in a penalty to those who live, respect, and abide by our present very fine tobacco program.

In my opinion, if the sale of "sucker" tobacco is permitted to remain unchallenged, serious injury will result to the tobacco program that we have all fought so hard to preserve and protect—it is the cash crop and, therefore, the lifeblood of my farmers.

All of us who introduced this legislation feel that existing law prohibits the sale of "sucker" tobacco, but since the Department of



Agriculture does not agree, we have drafted this legislation to show the absolute intent of Congress to prevent "sucker" tobacco from becoming competitive and, thereby, injurious to our entire tobacco program.

Mr. ABBITT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chelf.

Mr. Spence, we are delighted to have you with us here today and know of your great interest in this tobacco program and we deeply appreciate your coming, and will be glad to hear from you.

**STATEMENT OF HON. BRENT SPENCE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS OF THE FIFTH DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF KENTUCKY**

Mr. SPENCE. I have no statement to make, Mr. Chairman. I am deeply interested in the problem that is before you, because for the great majority of my farmers the cash crop is burley tobacco.

I am interested in this legislation. Mr. Watts introduced a bill and suggested that I introduce a similar bill, which I did with pleasure. I understand that the second crop produces inferior-grade tobacco. Of course, if that comes in contact with the good tobacco, it depreciates the price. I think that is an economic law that cannot be denied. And I think this is a very important question that you have to decide. There ought to be some control of the planting of the crop—the second crop on the allotted acreage.

I think that is a very important question to be solved for the benefit not only of the growers, but I think it would depress the price, but our foreign market should be considered. If you send an inferior tobacco to them, it will probably have a tendency to ruin the market. And I know this able committee which has made a great study of this question will come to some right solution that will give it help and the protection to our farmers that they need.

I have enjoyed this hearing very much. I come here partly to learn something of the conditions with regard to the bills. It has been a very interesting hearing.

I feel complimented that you gave me the opportunity to come here.

Mr. ABBITT. We appreciate your coming and we deeply appreciate your interest.

Mr. SPENCE. I have a hearing of my own committee, and I have to go.

Mr. ABBITT. We appreciate your coming. I would like the record to show that Senator Cooper from Kentucky expressed his regret that he could not be here today. He wanted me to say, however, that he has introduced a similar bill in the Senate and made a statement explaining it on the floor of the Senate. He was not able to come; his assistant, Mr. Guard, is here.

Mr. JENNINGS. I don't have any questions.

There is something I would like to discuss for a few minutes with Mr. Williams after we have completed here.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, may I make another statement?

Mr. ABBITT. We will be delighted to have you do so.

Mr. BASS. I have always been able to agree with the subcommittee here on just about everything we have ever done and Mr. Watts, who is a great champion of burley and other tobacco, has been a great help to us on the committee. He and I have always agreed in prin-

ciple on one thing: that as often as possible that we should submit these proposals which change and have an effect of changing the tobacco program to a referendum of growers.

I wonder if it would be possible to submit such proposals to a referendum of the growers and see if they approve it? What about that?

Mr. WATTS. Will you yield?

Mr. BASS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WATTS. Certainly, by the time you went to the trouble and expense of having a referendum, this year would be past. I am sure that the growers would vote 98 percent to sustain what we are trying to do here. I am satisfied that if the gentleman will check with his folks at home—and while on that subject let me ask Mr. Williams this question: You say the matter was discussed in Lexington?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. WATTS. Was Virginia represented, and Tennessee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WATTS. North Carolina?

Mr. WILLIAMS. All States were represented.

Mr. WATTS. And the opinion there was unanimous, was it not, that the practice ought to be stopped?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think they adopted resolutions.

There was no actual voting.

Mr. WATTS. Everybody was of the opinion, expressed the opinion, that it should be done and that it would be detrimental to the program if it was not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WATTS. I am sure that Congressman Bass and the rest of us are all going to be together on this when the smoke clears away. Maybe the Congressman wants some time to contact some of his people but this is something that I am sure if any of our growers or grower organizations, if they study it—and they have studied it—they will come to a conclusion it is a loophole through which many fine farmers who are complying with the program but who do not have irrigation systems will be reduced in their production by allowing some who are able to have irrigation systems grow sucker tobacco.

Mr. JENNINGS. And other climatic conditions.

Mr. WATTS. And climatic conditions maybe, too, to gain more poundage of the type of tobacco that will ultimately lower the quality of burley the world over and maybe seriously interfere with our quality standards that we set for export. The result will be that 15 to 30 percent of the farmers will become unduly enriched and others will have to take a cut. That it will spread to the other types of tobacco. You might just as well kiss the tobacco program goodbye if that happens. It was never the intention of Congress, or anybody else, that under a quota program you could raise more than 1 crop in any 1 year.

Mr. BASS. If the gentleman will yield back there.

Mr. WATTS. I am delighted to.

Mr. BASS. I never said that I opposed it.

Mr. WATTS. The gentleman just wants some time. I know that.

Mr. BASS. I think it should be explored. I think that it is a problem that has come up, and I personally do not feel that I have enough information right now to be final about it. And I am sure



that my distinguished friend from Kentucky, knowing his long standing on this problem, on the tobacco problems, I do not believe he would oppose a referendum in any case.

Mr. WATTS. Certainly, if the gentleman will yield again, I would not oppose a referendum. But this is a matter that is so fundamental to me, and I think the gentleman will find out it is so fundamental to the tobacco growers in his district.

Mr. BASS. Without belaboring it or delaying the committee any more, Mr. Chairman, I would like for the record to show that I think this legislation should be explored a little further, and that my personal opinion would be, as my friend from Kentucky's would be, that if we were to have a referendum that it would be passed overwhelmingly and accepted by the growers. When do we have another referendum?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Next year. In February of next year.

Mr. WATTS. This covers all types of tobacco.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I will yield back to you.

Mr. ABBITT. Are there any other questions of this witness?

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, do we have any other type of tobacco or any other threat to the program that are similar to this in nature. Let me qualify it a little further. Do we have anything confronting the burley program that is similar to the threat that we had in the other types of tobacco, such as the other large varieties?

Mr. WILLIAMS. You mean from the quality standpoint? Not at the present time. I don't think we have a serious quality problem in burley tobacco. It may be in the search for higher yields that one of these days in the future that you will stress this to the extent you will do like we did in flue-cured, affect your quality.

In my opinion, at the present time it is that you do not have a serious threat to quality on burley.

Mr. ELLIS. We do not know about the quality of these varieties.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We do have the potential there of that, but up to this time they have not appeared in production to the extent that we have had an opportunity to test the quality of it and it is not a serious threat in our production. Once it hits, then of course it may completely change the picture overnight.

Mr. JENNINGS. Are you familiar with the production of this mammoth, so-called mammoth variety tobacco, and are you looking at the overall as the future effect this might have upon the burley-tobacco program?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am looking at it to this extent, the production of it is pretty well limited within the experiment stations I understand at the present time. It is not generally among the farmers. Until it does get out among the farmers, it is not a serious threat. Once it gets to the farmers, then we will be particularly interested in it from the quality of the tobacco that it produces, not necessarily the yield, if it produces a ton or a ton and a half, if the quality is all right; it is all right.

Mr. JENNINGS. Do you have any figures or any records as to the amount of this type of tobacco that is now on hand and has been produced?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not.

Mr. JENNINGS. I ask that for this reason, How would that compare with the amount of sucker tobacco that has been harvested?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would say that it is considerably less.

Mr. JENNINGS. But you have no figures to substantiate that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. I do not feel that it has entered into the production. There may be some isolated cases where the farmer has gotten some. But it is not a serious threat. We never know when it could be. It could be during these winter months that these seeds have been scattered out and in 1958 it could be a serious thing. The flue-cured problem hit almost overnight.

Mr. JENNINGS. You are familiar with it, and you are officially appraised of the situation that you could give us the information which we need beltwide that would prevent the burley program coming in the same jeopardized position as the flue-cured with the so-called resistant varieties?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not familiar with, and I don't think we can become familiar with it, unless there is enough production of this type of tobacco for us to analyze and ascertain the quality of that tobacco.

Mr. JENNINGS. Let me say this then very frankly, that I am very much interested in that particular phase of this program. And I hope that you will become sufficiently acquainted with it, that it will not reach the stage that the Coker and so-called other varieties reached in the flue-cured tobacco; that it will not reach that stage before we in burley take some action, if action is warranted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would appreciate that, and I think you are very wise. We will cooperate with you to give you the full benefit of any information that we can get as we get it.

Mr. JENNINGS. Let me ask that you concern yourself with it to the extent that you seek that information rather than wait until the information happens to descend upon you, because I have reason to believe the threat is much larger than you have indicated to me. I think that it is something which we should be investigating and we should have an eagle eye upon because I think it could wreck our program almost in 1 year or almost overnight. And to me it is something that should be given every consideration before it reaches alarming stages.

Let me say in addressing myself to this problem of suckers I want to associate myself with the remarks that have been made by those who are in support of the program, and I think it is very imperative that we pass legislation which will prevent the growing of sucker tobacco or the growing of 2 crops of tobacco on 1 allotment, on the same acreage.

I think it would be disastrous and ruinous to the program, and I certainly want to advocate that we pass this legislation.

As I understand it, you say it will take legislation and the practice cannot be prevented administratively?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true.

Mr. JENNINGS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHELF. May I make one other remark? I would like to have the record straight and clear on one point. In my statement a while ago I may have left the implication or the meaning that I condemn everybody who has raised a sucker crop up to now. Frankly, I cannot blame the farmer, especially the little farmer who has been subjected to financial woes and obligations that he cannot meet for trying to make an extra dollar. The Lord knows he is carrying a terrific burden this day and age, especially down in my part of the country.



There are more blank store fronts on my little town of Lebanon, Ky., that I have seen since the thirties, because the little farmers are leaving the little farms and are going to Louisville and to General Electric and other places to seek employment because they can't make it on the farm. I don't condemn them for doing it, but I do say we have got to do something to preserve and protect our program.

My desire is to let the little fellow make a living; I don't want to destroy for the sake of 1 or 2 or even 5 or 10 percent the living of the vast majority of my people, because as Mr. Spence said it is the lifeblood of my people.

It is the cash crop. It is the lifeblood of my people. This tobacco program is that. I for one, if I never come back to this place—and believe you me I mean that—we have got to stick together and preserve and protect this program at all costs.

Thank you very much. I feel very deeply about this program.

Mr. WATTS. I would like to associate myself with Mr. Jennings in his remarks a few minutes ago about a program that would produce results. I agree with Mr. Williams, it has not become a problem yet, but the same thing that caused the farmer to go into the sucker business is going to cause him to grab on to anything that will produce some money.

I agree thoroughly with Mr. Jennings that we should give thought to those things and watch them as they come along. If we do that it is much easier to stop a practice that has not gained too firm a foothold than to stop one that is very well entrenched.

That is the reason that so many of us moved so quickly on the sucker bill. We realized that as yet it has not become a catastrophe or a threat that is insurmountable, but we are fearful of what the ultimate consequences will be if we do not stop it now. And I am sure that is what Mr. Jennings was talking about when he referred to the hope that you would look into the situation, to see that it did not develop before we had a chance to do something about it, if we could do anything about it.

I agree with Mr. Chelf, too, nobody wants the farmer not to have the opportunity to make a dollar, but the same rules should fit all parties.

Mr. ABBITT. I was interested in what you said some time ago about the meeting in Lexington. You say all of the States were there. I may have misunderstood. Did you mean all of the burley States were there?

Mr. WILLIAMS. All burley States were there.

Mr. ABBITT. Have you had any information from the flue growers or from any other types of tobacco how they feel about this measure?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It never has been a serious problem. If you interpret it, their interest is in the long-range program. I think it is one of those things that most of you need in the program everywhere, and I think the people down there will find pretty much the same interest.

Mr. ABBITT. I wonder if you had any expression from the other types of tobacco?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, sir; I have not either way.

Mr. MATTHEWS. May I ask just one question?

Mr. ABBITT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were able to come up with, of course, a very broad estimate. I think you said some 8 million to 15 million pounds of burley that might be affected. Do you have any idea as to whether or not there would be 7 million pounds of flue-cured tobacco affected now, or would you hazard a guess as to whether there is hardly any of that particular type where they harvest 2 crops?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would say in flue-cured it has been isolated up to this point. There may be some isolated cases where they have gone a little into it. I can visualize if it becomes a 20 million crop in burley that it won't take long. It will spread.

Mr. ABBITT. Your idea now is there is no problem at all, not being done in any consequence whatever in the flue-cured tobacco?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; there would be some cases, of course.

Mr. ABBITT. One farm in a hundred or 1 in 200?

Mr. WILLIAMS. One out of 10,000.

Mr. ABBITT. Is there anything else you would like to say about this particular legislation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, sir; that is all.

Mr. ABBITT. Any of your people who are here with you, would they like to say anything?

So far we have had 1 witness and the other 10 of us have testified along with him.

Mr. WATTS. We anticipate the Department can give us a formal report.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We will send up the report.

Mr. ELLIS. If the committee will make a formal request, then we will have something to go on.

Mr. CHELF. Get going.

Mr. ABBITT. I do not make those requests.

Mrs. Downey will attend to that for us.

On behalf of the subcommittee, we will request you to get us a report as soon as you possibly can. Mrs. Downey will attend to the request from the chairman of the full committee, who has always cooperated with us. The reason I was asking about the flue-cured, I know our chairman is extremely interested in all tobacco, particularly flue-cured, and I was trying to get that information on that situation so he would understand the situation.

If you will get that for us as soon as possible we will appreciate it. I am sure the chairman of the full committee will get a letter over there, too.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I might say this, I know you are interested in this: We have up through this week sold about two-thirds of the discount variety that we set up. We have got about 1,000,000 pounds left and, if we can sell the other third for what we have sold the two-thirds, we are going to be able to pay those individual growers down in your district there about 8 or 15 cents a pound dividends.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to express again my appreciation for what you have been doing, Mr. Williams, to help those men. And since you brought that up, I was going to ask you in an aside, but as I understand it you have actually begun selling that tobacco and before long you will be able to get rid of all of it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We sold two-thirds. We tried to sell immediately after the closing of the market, but we did not consider that the prices that we had were sufficient. We refused. We have priced it at a



price that we know is right to the Government and the farmers down there, and we are hoping it will move out so we can send your farmers these checks as soon as possible.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In that connection, too, as to the tobacco plants, you do not have any information as to whether or not they have been able to get the plants they need at this time or whether there might be some problem attending that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I don't think you will have that problem this year.

Mr. ABBITT. I might say that I am now informed that the chairman of the full committee, Mr. Cooley, sent a request to the Department yesterday. I know that it is a large organization you have over there, and I thought perhaps you might be able to track it down and get the answer right quick.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. ABBITT. Unless there are some other witnesses, we will adjourn. (The following statement was submitted to the subcommittee:)

STATEMENT OF HON. CARL D. PERKINS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM  
THE SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appear here today in support of H. R. 11061, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to tobacco acreage allotments.

This bill makes it unlawful for any grower of tobacco to harvest for marketing from the same acreage of a farm more than one crop of tobacco. The practice, as I understand, is not too prevalent at the present time but will interfere with the present tobacco program unless legislation is enacted by the Congress. I do not know of any individuals in the particular area that I am privileged to represent growing more than one crop on their tobacco allotments.

I do feel that we can all agree that such a practice would interfere with the present tobacco allotments by bringing about increased production which may in the long run affect all tobacco bases. I feel that it is equity for everybody concerned to only harvest one crop from a tobacco allotment.

(Whereupon, at 11:15 a. m., the hearing in the above-entitled matter was adjourned.)

×



LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 85-489  
H. R. 11058

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 11058 . . . . .	.1
Digest of Public Law 85-489 . . . . .	..2



## Index and summary of H. R. 11058

Feb. 27, 1958	Rep. Watts introduced H. R. 11058 which was referred to the House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
Mar. 11, 1958	House subcommittee ordered H. R. 11058 reported.
Mar. 12, 1958	House committee ordered H. R. 11058 reported.
Mar. 17, 1958	House committee reported H. R. 11058 without amendment. H. Report No. 1506. Print of bill and report.
Apr. 21, 1958	House passed H. R. 11058 without amendment.
Apr. 22, 1958	H. R. 11058 was referred to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill as referred.
June 18, 1958	Senate committee reported H. R. 11058 without amendment. S. Report No. 1725. Print of bill and report.
June 23, 1958	Senate passed H. R. 11058 without amendment.
July 2, 1958	Approved: Public Law 85-489.





DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 85-489

REDUCTION OF ALLOTMENTS FOR GROWTH OF TWO TOBACCO CROPS FROM SAME ACREAGE. Amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to provide that if in any calendar year more than one crop of tobacco is grown from either the same tobacco plants or different tobacco plants from the same acreage, the acreage allotment next established for the farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco was grown and harvested.









85TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

# H. R. 11058

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 27, 1958

Mr. WATTS introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act  
4       of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end  
5       thereof the following new sentence: "If in any calendar year  
6       more than one crop of tobacco is grown from (1) the same  
7       tobacco plants or (2) different tobacco plants, and is har-  
8       vested for marketing from the same acreage of a farm, the  
9       acreage allotment next established for such farm shall be  
10      reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which

1 more than one crop of tobacco has been so grown and  
 2 harvested.”

3 SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become  
 4 effective beginning with the 1958 crop of tobacco.

85TH CONGRESS  
 2D SESSION

H. R. 11058

## A BILL

To amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural  
 Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relat-  
 ing to tobacco acreage allotments.

By Mr. WATTS

FEBRUARY 27, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture







6. WATERSHEDS. Both Houses received from the Bureau of the Budget "plans for works of improvement" in N. M., N. Y., Okla., and Wis. pp. 3478-81
7. ROADS. Both Houses received from the Secretary of Commerce a proposed bill to "amend and supplement the Highway Revenue Act of 1956"; to the Public Works Committees. pp. 3478, 3481
8. FARM TAXES. Sen. Neuberger inserted a resolution from the Hermiston, Ore., Grange urging exemption from Federal taxation for all farmers whose annual income is less than \$3000. p. 3481
9. ECONOMIC SITUATION. Sen. Carlson stated that in 1949 tax cuts and easier credit led to rapid increases in national income, urged that the same solution be applied today, and inserted an editorial, "Recession Can Be Stopped." pp. 3488-9  
Sen. Smith, N. J., inserted 2 articles on the economic situation. pp. 3489-91  
Sen. Douglas discussed the unemployment figures for Feb. and their relation to the economic situation, and inserted a speech by AFL-CIO President Meany urging a tax cut to fight recession, with which Sen. Douglas concurred. pp. 35-3-9  
Sen. Kefauver discussed the economic situation and its relation to the monopolistic practices in certain industries, and inserted articles and a statement on business and the economy. pp. 3519-24  
Sen. Humphrey inserted an editorial urging the Administration to come forward with a unified fiscal policy, including stopping the Treasury's efforts to emphasize long-term financing of the public debt. pp. 3569-70  
Sen. Humphrey inserted articles criticizing the President's budget forecasts and stating that steel output was dropping again after a slight gain. pp. 3571-2
10. PUBLIC WORKS. The Public Works Committee reported with amendments S. Con. Res. 68, favoring the acceleration of civil construction programs for which appropriations have been made (S. Rept. 1376). p. 3580
11. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Morse inserted a series of articles analyzing our foreign aid policies in Asia. pp. 3493-98
12. SMALL FARMS. Sen. Morse inserted a letter he had received, and his reply, discussing the importance and need for more small farms. p. 3574
13. HOUSING. Sen. Morse spoke in opposition to increased interest rates for housing. pp. 3574-76
14. PERSONNEL. Sen. Johnston criticized recent reductions in Federal personnel as harmful in the current economic situation, and inserted a newspaper article on the matter. pp. 3516-17
15. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the "majority leader announced that following action on S. 3418, to stimulate residential construction, Senate will consider H. R. 10021, formula for taxing income of life-insurance companies, to be followed by S. J. Res. 162, to stay reduction in support prices or acreage allotments, and S. J. Res. 163, to stay reduction in dairy price supports." p. D195

HOUSE

16. PUBLIC WORKS. By a vote of 321 to 81, passed with amendments S. 497, the rivers and harbors and flood control bill, including 19 projects not included in the bill as reported by the Public Works Committee. pp. 3411-73
17. TOBACCO. The Tobacco Subcommittee ordered reported to the Agriculture Committee H. R. 11058 to provide for reductions in the acreage allotment of tobacco farmers who harvest more than one crop of tobacco in a year from the same acreage. p. D198
18. FORESTRY. The House Armed Services Committee ordered reported S. 3262, to authorize Federal grants to construct Olympic facilities for the 1960 winter games on Forest Service land. p. D198
19. MEATPACKERS. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee ordered reported with amendments H. R. 11234, to vest in the Federal Trade Commission "certain jurisdiction over meatpackers." p. D198
20. MEAT MARKETING. This office has received a limited supply of a committee print "Trends in Efficiency in Meat Processing and Distribution," a report from the Consumers Study Subcommittee, House Agriculture Committee. The subcommittee makes specific recommendations as follows:
  - "Technological and economic research on problems involved in reducing meat processing and distribution costs should be increased sharply.
  - "The Advisory Committee on Livestock and Meat Marketing should be re-constituted. A majority of the members of an advisory committee on meat marketing should have experience in medium and small meat processing and distributing businesses. Perhaps there should be separate committees on livestock production, and meat marketing.
  - "Research and educational programs should be undertaken jointly by representatives of employers and employees to discover ways and means of accelerating technical progress and cost reductions in meat processing and distribution.
  - "These great changes in technological and economic forces in meat distribution make it highly desirable that a broad research and experimental program aimed at producing fundamental economies in meat processing and distribution be undertaken promptly."
21. ROADS. The Rules Committee reported H. Res. 50, to provide 2 hours of debate on H. R. 9821, to authorize appropriations for the continuing construction of highways including forest highways, roads, and trails. pp. 3473, 3478
22. UNEMPLOYMENT. Rep. Barrett urged immediate action against unemployment, including tax reductions and removal "of all vestiges of the tight money policy which was the main culprit in bring on the present slump." pp. 3573-4







9. SOIL BANK. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment S. 2937, to provide equitable treatment for producers participating in the Soil Bank program on the basis of incorrect information furnished to them by the Government (S. Rept. 1383). pp. 3585-6
10. DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Proxmire criticized the proposed reduction in dairy price supports and inserted a telegram from the Pulaski, Wis., Chamber of Commerce opposing the cut. Sen. Mansfield stated that, "there is unity between the future welfare and well-being of the farmer and of businessmen and workers." pp. 3596-7
11. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Sparkman stated that Senate approval of \$250 million for the soil bank was only a stopgap measure with more comprehensive legislation needed, and inserted an article by Drew Pearson on the situation of cotton farmers in Ala. p. 3597  
Sen. Morse inserted 8 letters from Ore. farmers, opposing dairy price support reductions and any cuts in soil conservation cost sharing practices, contending that the rest of the economy did not operate in a free market so neither should the farmers. He also inserted his reply to one person who wrote to the Secretary to commend the present farm program. pp. 3671-3
12. STATEHOOD. Sen. Russell opposed statehood for Alaska until conditions had been improved, including more farms to allow Alaska to feed itself. pp. 3646-7
13. SMALL BUSINESS. Sen. Humphrey inserted a newspaper article on the growing tendency for big corporations to get bigger and small businesses to decline. p. 3647

HOUSE

14. FARM PROGRAM; TOBACCO; DAIRY; FOREST SERVICE. The Committee on Agriculture ordered reported the following bill (p. D203):  
H. R. 11058, to provide for reductions in the acreage allotment of tobacco farmers who harvest more than one crop of tobacco in a year from the same acreage;  
With amendment, H. R. 11178, to extend the special dairy programs;  
With amendment, H. R. 7953, to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, with the deletion of section 8, which would have required forest road and trail users to pay maintenance costs for such roads.
15. WHEAT; ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 11086, to reduce acreage history by the amount of excess wheat production actually depleted, but to allow no change for surplus production stored on the farm or delivered to the Department (H. Rept. 1497). p. 3689
16. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President a budget amendment for the fiscal year 1959 proposing increases of \$10,000,000 for Watershed Protection to accelerate the program of installing works of improvement on small watersheds under Public Law 566, and \$4,780,000 for Flood Prevention to accelerate the installation of flood prevention works of improvement on the 11 major watersheds as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944 (H. Doc. 351); to the Appropriations Committee. p. 3689
17. TERRITORIES. Received from the Comptroller General a report on activities of the government of the Virgin Islands. p. 3689

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

18. FOREIGN AID. Extension of remarks of Sen. Dworshak inserting an editorial on foreign aid and stating that the article "voices no opinions, but is a carefully documented story in cold figures of the tremendous expenditures..." pp. A2288-9  
Sen. Hennings inserted an editorial, "Foreign Aid Paradox." p. A2305  
Rep. Celler inserted a statement, "Strength Through Trade and Aid," pp. A2311-2
19. BUDGET. Rep. Abernethy inserted an article which reviews some of the facts as to the actual budgetary position and states that "for the budget the President presented 6 weeks ago is now scarcely worth the paper it is written on." p. A2292
20. WATER POLLUTION. Extension of remarks of Sen. Neuberger stating that "it is vital that Federal grants-in-aid for eliminating stream pollution be continued," and inserting a letter to the editor on this subject. pp. A2292-3
21. TOBACCO; RESEARCH. Sen. Scott inserted an address by Lewis Gruber, president of the P. Lorillard Co., at a meeting of the Washington Advertising Club, on the occasion of the club's special achievement award to Mr. Gruber for "his precedent-setting leadership in cigarette research and marketing." pp. A2295-6
22. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Breeding inserted an article which defends Kansas' position as the Nation's prime wheat State. p. A2303  
Extension of remarks of Sen. Watkins inserting an article, "let's Look at the Record," and stating it "points out that Secretary Benson's critics should be invited to stay on the record before they make their criticisms." p. A2316  
Rep. Curtis, Mo., inserted an editorial, "Let's Recognize a Changing Farm Economy." p. A2310

BILLS INTRODUCED

23. DAIRY INDUSTRY. S. 3456, by Sen. Proxmire (for himself and others), to provide a substantially self-financing program to protect the returns of producers of milk and butterfat used in manufactured dairy products to the producers thereof, to provide a formula for computing parity farm income and parity income equivalent prices, to establish a Federal Dairy Advisory Committee, to promote and protect and encourage family-scale farming in the dairy industry, to enable milk producers to keep supplies in reasonable balance with the need and demand therefor, to prevent discrimination between the various manufactured dairy products in Government food-purchasing programs; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of Sen. Proxmire. pp. 3588-9
24. FORESTS. S. 3458, by Sen. Dworshak, to add certain lands located in Idaho to the Boise and Payette National Forests; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.
25. PARITY FORMULA. S. 3466, by Sen. Sparkman (for himself and Sen. Hill), and H. R. 11368, by Rep. Roberts, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to make the transitional parity formula inoperative for basic agricultural commodities for 1958; to Agriculture and Forestry and Agriculture Committees. Remarks of Sen. Sparkman. p. 3664







Mar. 11, 1958

HOUSE

16. PRICE SUPPORTS. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported with amendment S. J. Res. 162, to prohibit any reduction in price supports or acreage allotments for any commodity, except tobacco, below 1957 levels (p. D220). It is understood that the committee agreed to an amendment limiting the measure to one year. Reps. McCormack, Albert, and Halleck discussed the date for calling up the measure, and Rep. McCormack stated that it could be considered this week (pp. 4052-3).
17. WILDLIFE. Passed without amendment H. R. 10679, to allow the Secretary of the Interior to use funds available under the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act to acquire by lease, purchase, or exchange, small wetland and pot-hole areas to be designated as "Waterfowl Production Areas." p. 4054  
By unanimous consent recommitted a similar bill, H. R. 10803, to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. p. 4054
18. FOREST SERVICE. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 7953, to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, with the deletion of Section 8, which would have required forest road and trail users to pay maintenance costs for such roads (H. Rept. 1505). p. 4083
19. TOBACCO. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11058 to reduce the acreage allotments of tobacco farmers who harvest more than one crop of tobacco in a year from the same acreage (H. Rept. 1506). p. 4083
20. MEATPACKERS. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendment H. R. 11234, to vest in the FTC jurisdiction over meatpacker trade practices in selling other produce than livestock or poultry (H. Rept. 1507). p. 4083
21. CORN. At the request of Rep. Ford, passed over H. R. 10316, to exclude Ottawa County, Mich., from the commercial corn-producing area during 1958. p. 4053
22. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment S. 1031, to construct and maintain four units of the Greater Wenatchee project, Wash. (H. Rept. 1504). p. 4083
23. INFORMATION. Struck from the Consent Calendar, at the request of Rep. Byrnes, Wis., H. R. 2767, to restrict the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records. p. 4058
24. UNEMPLOYMENT. Several Reps. discussed unemployment and the economic situation (pp. 4052, 4061-2, 4075-9, 4082). Rep. Christopher contended that the source of new wealth was the producer of raw materials, including the farmer, and that the decline in farm income was a factor in promoting recession (pp. 4076-7)
25. PERSONNEL; SECURITY. Rep. Walter inserted correspondence with the League of Women Voters in which he urged the adoption of S. 1411, which makes all Government jobs sensitive insofar as security is concerned. pp. 4059-60
26. SMALL BUSINESS LOANS. Rep. Coffin spoke on the value of Small Business Administration loans in granting help in any disaster areas. pp. 4062-3

27. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Rep. Bailey criticized the Commerce Department for making surveys of Congressional districts to determine the importance of imports and exports to the economy of such districts, and asserted that the estimates of jobs linked to exports was exaggerated. pp. 4066-7
28. BUDGETING. Received from the President proposed budget amendments, including \$125,250,000 for Civil Functions of the Defense Department and \$26,200,000 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (H. Doc. 354); to Appropriations Committee. p. 4083

#### ITEMS IN APPENDIX

29. RURAL DEVELOPMENT. Extension of remarks of Sen. Potter inserting an editorial, "Resource Development Aids Farming, Industry in Michigan's Upper Peninsula," and stating that "this article reflects the clear recognition of the need for a broad program for areas that need increased incomes for farm families." p. A2425
30. DAIRY PRODUCTS. Sen. Proxmire inserted a letter from the president of a Wisc. bank which states that businessmen are strongly opposed to reduction of the price supports for dairy commodities. p. A2426
31. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Coad inserted an editorial, "The Farm Subsidy Myth," which states that "no matter how many times it is disproved, the myth persists that farm subsidies are costing the Nation about \$5 billion a year." p. A2442  
Rep. Alger inserted an editorial defending the Secretary's proposal for farm policy. pp. A2442-3  
Extension of remarks of Rep. Hiestand in defense of the Secretary and stating that "rarely has a Cabinet member been vilified as much as Ezra Taft Benson." p. A2469  
Extension of remarks of Rep. Curtis, Mo., inserting excerpts from an article discussing the disbandment of the Iowa unit of the Nat'l Farm Organization. p. A2474  
Rep. Frelinghuysen inserted an editorial, "Ezra's Our Hope." p. A2477  
Extension of remarks of Rep. Gwinn stating that "in my judgment, there is no farm problem -- there is the problem of Government and what it has done to the farmer," and inserting an editorial, "Let's Set The Farmer Free.: pp. A2486-7  
Extension of remarks of Rep. Curtis, Mo., in support of the administration's farm program and inserting data, "Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-eight Farm Facts." pp. A2487-9
32. TEXTILES. Rep. McIntire inserted William F. Sullivan's, secretary of the Northern Textile Ass'n, statement outlining the economic problems of the cotton textile industry. pp. A2445-6
33. WOOL. Sen. Dworshak inserted an article describing the important contribution to the economy of Idaho made by the sheep industry. pp. A2455-6

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

34. SURPLUS FOOD. S. 3501, by Sen. Proxmire, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to expend funds appropriated for the diversion of surplus farm commodities to provide balanced diets in schools and institutions and for needy families; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author. p. 4001



## SUCKER TOBACCO

---

MARCH 17, 1958.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. COOLEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

### REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 11058]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11058) to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

#### STATEMENT

When tobacco is transplanted early in the spring, has favorable growing conditions, matures and is harvested early, and favorable growing conditions continue until late into the fall, some farmers are able to harvest a second crop of tobacco from the same acreage. This second picking is usually called a "sucker crop."

Previous to 1957 these conditions had occurred only in relatively isolated instances. The volume of tobacco which was added to the market by this second crop was not considered of any significance.

In 1957, however, growing conditions were so favorable in a large portion of the Burley Belt that a substantially larger acreage of "suckers" was harvested. It has been estimated that from 5 million to 15 million pounds of burley "suckers" were harvested and marketed last year. This contributes to the present supply of burley tobacco, of course, and will be taken into consideration in establishing marketing quotas and acreage allotments for the next season.

This bill would discourage the harvesting and marketing of a "sucker crop" by providing that if in any calendar year more than one crop of tobacco is grown from either the same tobacco plants or different tobacco plants from the same tobacco acreage, the acreage allotment next established for the farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco was grown and harvested.

## DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL

Technicians from the Department of Agriculture, in discussing the proposed legislation with the Tobacco Subcommittee, were strongly in favor of the enactment of the bill. The formal report of the Department of Agriculture, quoted below, indicates that it has no objection to the passage of the bill.

MARCH 10, 1958.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,  
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,  
House of Representatives.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: This is in reply to your request of March 4, 1958, for a report on H. R. 11058, a bill to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments.

This Department has no objection to the passage of the bill.

The bill amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide that in the event a second crop of tobacco is harvested for marketing from the same acreage, the allotment next established for such farm shall be reduced by the acreage from which a second crop is harvested.

The 1957 crop of burley tobacco was transplanted early, had favorable growing conditions, matured and was harvested early in some areas. With continued favorable growing conditions and a late fall, some farmers were able to harvest a second crop of tobacco from their allotted acreages. This second crop is commonly called "suckers." Although this has happened before in isolated instances, it has not heretofore been considered as contributing any significant quantity to the total supply of burley tobacco. However, due to the favorable growing season existing in some sections of the burley area in 1957, substantially larger acreages of "suckers" were harvested. It has been variously estimated that from 5 million to 15 million pounds of burley "suckers" were harvested and marketed last year. This has contributed to the present surplus of burley tobacco. It appears reasonable to expect this problem will become more acute in the future. "Suckers" cannot always be distinguished on the warehouse floor, but are significantly different from a chemical and flavor standpoint and are of inferior quality. Although the practice could apply to all kinds of tobacco, it has heretofore been limited primarily to burley tobacco.

The enactment of this bill will have no significant effect on expenditure of administrative or CCC capital funds.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,  
*Acting Secretary.*

## CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):



## AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

SEC. 313. \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Secretary on the basis of average yield per acre of tobacco for the State during the five years last preceding the year in which the national marketing quota is proclaimed, adjusted for abnormal conditions of production, may convert the State marketing quota into a State acreage allotment, and allot the same through the local committees among farms on the basis of the factors set forth in subsection (b), using past acreage (harvested and diverted) in lieu of the past marketing of tobacco; and the Secretary on the basis of the national average yield during the same period, similarly adjusted, may also convert into an acreage allotment the amount reserved from the national quota pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c), and on the basis of the factors set forth in subsection (c) and the past tobacco experience of the farm operator, allot the same through the local committees among farms on which no tobacco was produced during the last five years. Except for farms last mentioned or a farm operated, controlled, or directed by a person who also operates, controls, or directs another farm on which tobacco is produced, the farm-acreage allotment shall be increased by the smaller of (1) 20 per centum of such allotment or (2) the percentage by which the normal yield of such allotment (as determined through the local committees in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary) is less than three thousand two hundred pounds, in the case of flue-cured tobacco, and two thousand four hundred pounds in the case of other kinds of tobacco: *Provided*, That the normal yield of the estimated number of acres so added to farm acreage allotments in any State shall be considered as a part of the State marketing quota in applying the proviso in subsection (a). The actual production of the acreage allotment established for a farm pursuant to this subsection shall be the amount of the farm marketing quota. If any amount of tobacco shall be marketed as having been produced on the acreage allotment for any farm which in fact was produced on a different farm, the acreage allotments next established for both such farms shall be reduced by that percentage which such amount was of the respective farm marketing quota, except that such reduction for any such farm shall not be made if the Secretary through the local committees finds that no person connected with such farm caused, aided, or acquiesced in such marketing; and if proof of the disposition of any amount of tobacco is not furnished as required by the Secretary, the acreage allotment next established for the farm on which such tobacco is produced shall be reduced by a percentage similarly computed. *If in any calendar year more than one crop of tobacco is grown from (1) the same tobacco plants or (2) different tobacco plants, and is harvested for marketing from the same acreage of a farm, the acreage allotment next established for such farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco has been so grown and harvested.*



Union Calendar No. 593

85<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
2<sup>D</sup> SESSION

# H. R. 11058

[Report No. 1506]

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 27, 1958

Mr. WATTS introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

MARCH 17, 1958

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

## A BILL

To amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments.

1     *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2     *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3     That section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act  
4     of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end  
5     thereof the following new sentence: "If in any calendar year  
6     more than one crop of tobacco is grown from (1) the same  
7     tobacco plants or (2) different tobacco plants, and is har-  
8     vested for marketing from the same acreage of a farm, the  
9     acreage allotment next established for such farm shall be  
10    reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which

1 more than one crop of tobacco has been so grown and  
2 harvested.”

3 SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become  
4 effective beginning with the 1958 crop of tobacco.

Union Calendar No. 593

85TH CONGRESS  
2d Session

**H. R. 11058**

[Report No. 1506]

---

## A BILL

To amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural  
Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relat-  
ing to tobacco acreage allotments.

---

By Mr. WATTS

---

FEBRUARY 27, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

MARCH 17, 1958

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on  
the State of the Union and ordered to be printed







April 21, 1958

11. FORESTRY. Sens. Thye and Humphrey inserted a resolution of the St. Louis Co. Development Assoc., Duluth, Minn., urging the appropriation of additional funds to the Forest Service to be used for the replanting of trees in the denuded areas of the Superior National Forest. pp. 6021-22, 6023  
Sen. Neuberger received unanimous consent to have postponed indefinitely S. 3619, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System. He stated that the bill "was in the nature of a report and was to have been referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but was mistakenly given a bill number by the clerk." p. 6039  
Sen. Douglas spoke in favor of the enactment of S. 1176, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System on the public lands, and inserted two articles favoring such legislation. pp. 6064-66
12. ECONOMIC SITUATION. Sen. Proxmire inserted Sen. Johnson's speech on the present state of our economy, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund report on the American economy (including a proposal dealing with the "hard-core" transfer problem of 1.2 million farm units), and Kiplinger's prediction of an economic boom ahead. pp. 6048-55  
Sen. Douglas inserted excerpts from the anti-recession program of the Committee for Economic Development. pp. 6061-3
13. RECLAMATION. Sen. Langer inserted a resolution by the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District urging an increase in appropriations for Missouri River Basin studies in fiscal year 1959. p. 6070  
Sen. Langer inserted a Minot, N. D., City Council resolution urging the provision of funds to start construction of the Garrison diversion unit in fiscal year 1960. pp. 6070-1
14. FLOOD CONTROL. Sen. Kuchel stated there was a need for new flood control authorizations, and pointed to the results to Southern Calif. of the President's veto of S. 497. pp. 6078-80
15. YOUNG FARMERS. Sen. Goldwater inserted outline biographies of four outstanding young farmers picked by the Junior Chamber of Commerce from nominees from every State, and the results of a poll of 38 of them, showing a 30 to 8 vote opposing higher price supports and a 37 to 1 vote in favor of less Government control of agriculture. pp. 6086-8
16. HOUSING. Sen. Clark criticized the Administration and asserted that \$1,356,400,000 of funds authorized by the Congress for housing purposes is at present either impounded or unallocated." pp. 6103-3
17. FARM COOPERATIVES. Sen. Watkins inserted a resolution by the National Council on Farmer Cooperatives urging Congress to assist farmer cooperatives to help farmers achieve a "free and prosperous agriculture." pp. 6109-10
18. BEEF PRICES. Sen. Thye inserted a table from the American Cattle Producer magazine showing the farm-retail spread in choice beef from 1947 through 1957. p. 6042
19. INFORMATION. Sen. Proxmire called for less secrecy in making Government information available to the public, and inserted an article on the subject. pp. 6047-48

HOUSE

20. DURUM WHEAT. Passed without amendment S. 3120, to provide increases in durum wheat allotments for 1958 and 1959 in the Tulalake area, Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, Calif. This bill will now be sent to the President. A similar House bill, H. R. 11092, was laid on the table. p. 6119
21. TOBACCO. Passed without amendment H. R. 11058, to reduce the acreage allotments of tobacco farmers who harvest more than one crop of tobacco in a year from the same acreage. p. 6114
22. ANNUAL LEAVE. Passed as reported H. R. 7710, to provide for the lump-sum payment of all accumulated and accrued annual leave of deceased Government employees. p. 6115
23. RECLAMATION. Passed without amendment S. 2037, to authorize the performance of necessary protection work between the Yuma project and Boulder Dam. p. 6113
24. COTTON. The Cotton Subcommittee ordered reported to the Agriculture Committee H. R. 9936, to increase the rate of penalty for overplanting cotton acreage allotments. p. D327
25. CROP INSURANCE. Rep. Hill commended the operations of the crop insurance program and urged that FCIC programs be extended to more farmers. p. 6123
26. CORN. At the request of Rep. Ford, passed over H. R. 10316, to exclude Ottawa County, Mich., from the commercial corn-producing area during 1958, and struck the bill from the Consent Calendar. p. 6113
27. WATER RESOURCES. Rep. Staggers spoke against any Potomac River watershed plans which would flood lands in his Congressional District in West Va. p. 6113
28. FOREST SERVICE. Passed as reported H. R. 7953, to facilitate and simplify the administration of the national forests. The bill provides authority to:
  - "Raise the limitation on reimbursement (from \$50 to \$2,500, except the limitation is not raised for employees of the Forest Service) to owners of rented equipment under verbal agreement for damages occurring while in use by the Forest Service.
  - "Contract with private parties to train, work, and care for Government-owned pack stock held in reserve for fire emergency purposes.
  - "Reimburse employees of the Forest Service for loss of, or damage to, clothing and other personal effects from fires, floods, or other casualties at places of temporary storage while engaged in connection with such casualties.
  - "Use Forest Service appropriations to cover costs of transporting employees' automobiles between points in Alaska in connection with transfer of official stations.
  - "Notify employees at isolated locations of serious illness or death of close relatives and pay cost of transporting such employees to point of nearest public transportation.
  - "Transfer to States fire-lookout towers and other improvements for fire control when no longer needed by the Forest Service but of value to States in their fire-protective systems. Transferred property would revert to the United States if it is not put to the use for which transferred within 2 years after the transfer, or if within 15 years after the transfer it ceases for a period of 2 years to be used for such purpose.



The second thought for a minute and then he said: "I'll tell you, when I get my crop in, I'm agoin' to buy my wife a new washing machine." I think this fellow was ultraconservative, not thinking about one of those fancy new electric driven affairs. He was talking about one of the good sturdy push-and-pull ones. The third man said nothing. The other two looked at him, and finally he said: "Boys, you better pass me that jug again. I ain't out of debt yet."

#### CORRECTION OF ROLLCALLS

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 29, I was recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and the Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 5, on January 23, I was recorded as being absent. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and the Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MARTIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of securing information as to the full program for this week. I understand there is a change in the program and, perhaps, we might be having an unemployment bill later in the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the acting majority leader announced that the margarine ration bill for the Navy would be coming up with the usual reservation that any further program would be announced later. Since that announcement two rules have been reported—one on the bill, H. R. 11378, Federal aid to school in impacted areas and S. 1031, authorizing the Chief Joseph project. That brings us down to Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. May I say, in view of the reference made by my friend concerning the emergency unemployment compensation legislation that if the bill is reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means and if a rule is obtained in time, that bill will be brought up this week, but not before Thursday.

Mr. MARTIN. And that is the full program for the week as the majority leader sees it at the moment?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the program so far as I am able to announce it at the present time. Of course, the last bill I mentioned depends upon two factors—one that the bill be reported out of the legislative committee and the other that a rule is reported by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in further clarification of my response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], where I referred to the margarine ration bill for the Navy and the Federal aid to schools in impacted areas bills, I want to announce that the school aid bill will not come up before Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman.

#### POTOMAC RIVER WATERSHED

(Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Corps of Engineers held a public hearing in Moorefield, W. Va., relative to water development plans for the Potomac River watershed, with particular reference to the south branch and tributaries in Hampshire, Hardy, Grant, and Pendleton Counties. All of these countries are in the Second Congressional District of West Virginia, which I have the honor to represent.

This public hearing was one of a series being held intending to be exploratory in nature and for the purpose of obtaining the views of local interests on requirements for flood control, water supply, pollution abatement and other related problems in the South Branch Basin for use in preparing a comprehensive water development plan for the entire Potomac River Basin.

The proposal to construct a large reservoir for water supply has caused a great deal of controversy in my district. The citizens are alarmed because the large dams would cause the flooding of valuable agricultural lands in that area. I am sure each of us can understand their anxiety in any proposal which would cause them to lose their homes and farms.

However, in talking with the engineers I am informed that no plans have been made as yet and will not be for some time until a thorough investigation of the situation has been made. Preliminary suggestions and plans will then be submitted involving many different proposals. It is my understanding that in about a year the Army engineers will submit a progress report containing 4 or 5 alternate recommendations. This will finally be narrowed down to one concrete plan which will then be submitted to the Congress. According to the engineers it will be many years yet before work will commence.

The cooperating services will be the Department of Agriculture, including the Soil Conservation Service, Office of Agriculture Economics, Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Geological Survey, Public Health Service, and also the State agencies.

I want to state to the Congress now that I cannot and will not be for any such projects which would flood and cause the destruction of property in the Second District of West Virginia. I shall oppose any proposal which would jeopardize the homes and farms of the citizens of the eastern panhandle of West Virginia. It is my belief that there are

other plans which can be worked out to assure an adequate supply of water for the city of Washington. I feel every effort should be made to protect the property owners.

#### CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

#### EXCLUDING OTTAWA COUNTY, MICH., FROM COMMERCIAL CORN-PRODUCING AREA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10316) to exclude Ottawa County, Mich., from the commercial corn-producing area during 1958.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as the author of this bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be stricken from the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### YUMA PROJECT AND BOULDER DAM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2037) to amend the act of June 28, 1946, authorizing the performance of necessary protection work between the Yuma project and Boulder Dam by the Bureau of Reclamation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That that portion of the act of June 28, 1946 (60 Stat. 338), which reads "(b) constructing, improving, extending, operating, and maintaining protection and drainage works and systems along the Colorado River" is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Including such protection and drainage works and systems within a non-Federal reclamation project when need for such systems results from irrigation operations on Federal reclamation projects."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### APPOINTMENT OF NECESSARY LAW CLERKS AND SECRETARIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3816) to amend section 752 of title 28, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 752 of title 28, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows: "District judges may appoint necessary law clerk and secretaries."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "secretaries" and insert "secretaries subject to any limitation on the aggregate salaries of such employees which may be imposed by law."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.



## FOREST SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7953) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act of March 4, 1913, as amended (16 U. S. C. 502), is hereby amended by substituting for the last proviso of subsection (c) the following: "And provided further, That except for fire fighting emergencies no reimbursement herein authorized shall be made in an amount in excess of \$50 to persons who were employees of the Forest Service prior to the time the equipment was obtained or \$2,500 in any other case, unless the equipment was made available under a written agreement, contract, or lease," and by changing the designation of that subsection from (c) to (d) and inserting a new subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) To contract with public and private agencies, corporations, firms, associations, or individuals to train, provide forage, care, and housing for, and to work pack stock owned and held in reserve by the Forest Service for fire emergency purposes and as all or part of the consideration therefore to permit such contractors to use the stock for their own purposes during the periods of nonuse by the Forest Service."

SEC. 2. Funds available to the Forest Service may be used in amounts not exceeding \$100 in any single claim, for reimbursing employees of the Forest Service for loss of or damage to clothing and other personal effects resulting from fires, floods, or other casualties at or near the place in which such property is temporarily stored during services of the employees in connection with such casualties.

SEC. 3. Funds available to the Forest Service may be used, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to in this act as Secretary) for expenses of transporting automobiles of employees of that Service between points in Alaska in connection with transfers of official stations of such employees to meet the needs of the Service.

SEC. 4. Section 202 of the act of September 21, 1944 (16 U. S. C. 554b), is hereby amended to read as follows: "Appropriations for the Forest Service shall be available for medical supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the immediate relief of artisans, laborers, and other employees engaged in any hazardous work under the Forest Service, and for expenses of notifying employees of the death or serious illness of close relatives and, in such cases where no public transportation is available, for transporting the employees to a point where public transportation is available."

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized, subject to such conditions as he may prescribe, to transfer, without reimbursement or at such prices and upon such terms as he may impose, to States and political subdivisions or agencies thereof fire lookout towers and other structures or improvements used by the Forest Service for fire prevention or suppression purposes, and the land used in connection therewith if such land is outside national forest boundaries, when they are no longer needed by the Forest Service for such purposes but are of value to the State or political subdivision or agency thereof in its fire protection system: *Provided*, That if any property so transferred is not put to use for the purpose for which it was transferred within 2 years from the date of transfer, or if, within 15 years from the date of transfer, any such property should cease to be used for the purpose for which it was transferred for a period of 2 years, title thereto shall revert to and immediately revert in the United States.

SEC. 6. Section 10 of the act of April 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 82), is hereby amended to read as follows: "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 7 of the act of August 23, 1912, as amended (31 U. S. C. 679), appropriations for the protection and management of the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service shall be available to pay for telephone service installed in residences of employees and of persons co-operating with the Forest Service who reside within or near such lands when such installation is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be needed in protecting such lands: *Provided*, That in addition to the monthly local service charge the Government may pay only such tolls or other charges as are required strictly for the public business."

SEC. 7. Any moneys received by the United States with respect to lands under the administration of the Forest Service (1) as a result of the forfeiture of a bond or deposit by a permittee or timber purchaser for failure to complete performance of improvement, protection, or rehabilitation work required under the permit or timber-sale contract or (2) as a result of a judgment, compromise, or settlement of any claim, involving present or potential damage to lands or improvements, shall be covered into the Treasury and are hereby appropriated and made available until expended to cover the cost to the United States of any improvement, protection, or rehabilitation work on lands under the administration of the Forest Service rendered necessary by the action which led to the forfeiture, judgment, compromise, or settlement: *Provided*, That any portion of the moneys so received in excess of the amount expended in performing the work necessitated by the action which led to their receipt shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 8. The Secretary may require the users of roads or trails on national forest and other lands under the administrative control of the Forest Service to deposit such sums as the Secretary estimates to be necessary to cover the cost of maintenance made necessary by their use thereof. Such deposits shall be covered into the Treasury and are hereby appropriated and made available, until expended as the Secretary may direct, to cover road and trail maintenance on such lands.

SEC. 9. The proviso in the act of May 11, 1922, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, under the item "General expenses, Forest Service," limiting the expenditure of funds for publication (42 Stat. 507, 521, 16 U. S. C. 556) is hereby amended by substituting for the phrase "And provided further," the phrase "Provided further" and adding a further proviso so that the limiting provisions shall read "Provided further, That hereafter no part of any funds appropriated for the Forest Service shall be paid or used for the purpose of paying for, in whole or in part, the preparation or publication of any newspaper or magazine article, but this shall not prevent the giving out to all persons, without discrimination, including newspapers and magazine writers and publishers, of any facts or official information of value to the public: *And provided further*, That this prohibition shall not apply to scientific or technical articles prepared for or published in scientific publications."

SEC. 10. Section 5 of the act of March 3, 1925, as amended (16 U. S. C. 555), is hereby further amended by changing the amount in the last proviso to \$50,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, line 12, strike out section 8.  
Page 5, line 21, strike out "9" and insert "8."

Page 6, line 15, strike out "10" and insert "9."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SUCKER TOBACCO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11058) to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If in any calendar year more than one crop of tobacco is grown from (1) the same tobacco plants or (2) different tobacco plants, and is harvested for marketing from the same acreage of a farm, the acreage allotment next established for such farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco has been so grown and harvested."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall become effective beginning with the 1958 crop of tobacco.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## STATE OF NEW YORK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7738) for the relief of the State of New York.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

## CLAIMS ARISING IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES INCIDENT TO NON-COMBAT ACTIVITIES OF THE COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10425) to amend section 2734 of title 10, United States Code so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle claims arising in foreign countries incident to noncombat activities of the Coast Guard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That title 10 of the United States Code is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2734 is amended as follows:

(A) The catchline is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2734. Property loss; personal injury or death; incident to noncombat activities of the Armed Forces; foreign countries."

(B) Subsection (a) is amended as follows:

(i) by striking out the words "of a military department" and inserting in place thereof the word "concerned"; and

(ii) by striking out the words "the department concerned" and inserting in place thereof the words "the military department concerned or the Coast Guard, as the case may be."







85TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

# H. R. 11058

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 22, 1958

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

---

## AN ACT

To amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act  
4       of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end  
5       thereof the following new sentence: "If in any calendar year  
6       more than one crop of tobacco is grown from (1) the same  
7       tobacco plants or (2) different tobacco plants, and is har-  
8       vested for marketing from the same acreage of a farm, the  
9       acreage allotment next established for such farm shall be  
10      reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which

1 more than one crop of tobacco has been so grown and  
2 harvested."

3 SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become  
4 effective beginning with the 1958 crop of tobacco.

Passed the House of Representatives April 21, 1958.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

*Clerk.*



85TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

**H. R. 11058**

---

---

**AN ACT**

---

---

To amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural  
Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relat-  
ing to tobacco acreage allotments.

---

---

APRIL 22, 1958

Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Agriculture and Forestry







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 19, 1958  
For actions of June 18, 1958  
85th-2d, No. 100

### CONTENTS

Agricultural appropriations.....	21		
Appropriations.....	21		
Budgeting.....	23		
Buildings.....	34		
Conservation.....	21		
Electrification.....	18,29		
Farm program.....	28		
Federal-State relations.....	15		
Flood control.....	22		
Foreign aid.....	17,23	Personnel.....	13
Forestry.....	19	Personnel ethics.....	11
Housing.....	36	Pest control.....	31
Humane slaughter.....	1	Procedure.....	35
Libraries.....	26	Public works.....	22
Livestock.....	1	REA.....	29
Livestock loans.....	2	Reclamation.....	12,20
Marketing.....	30	Research.....	30
Minerals.....	33	School milk.....	21
Paperwork.....	26	Statehood.....	8,20,27
		Surplus food.....	4,21,25,30
		Surplus property.....	16
		Taxation.....	5
		Textiles.....	9
		Tobacco.....	3
		Training.....	13
		Transportation.....	7,14
		Vegetables.....	10
		Watersheds.....	6,24
		Wildlife.....	31

**HIGHLIGHTS:** Senate committee reported bills to authorize study of humane slaughter methods; extend special livestock loan authority; and reduce allotments for 2nd crop of tobacco grown on allotment in one year. House subcommittee ordered reported bill to authorize training for Federal employees at outside facilities. Conferees agreed to file report on mutual security authorization bill.

### SENATE

- 1. HUMANE SLAUGHTER.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments H. R. 8308, to require the use of humane methods of slaughter of livestock and poultry (S. Rept. 1724) (p. 10429-30). The Daily Digest reported that the substitute amendment would provide for a study of this subject by the Department and a report to Congress on its finding within 2 years (pp. D557-8).
- 2. LIVESTOCK LOANS.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment H. R. 11424, to extend for 2 years (through July 14, 1961) certain authority of the Secretary for special livestock loans (S. Rept. 1723). p. 10429
- 3. TOBACCO.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11058, to reduce the acreage allotments of tobacco farmers who harvest more than one crop of tobacco in a year from the same acreage (S. Rept. 1725). p. 10430
- 4. SURPLUS FOODS.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12164, to permit the donation of surplus foods to nonprofit summer camps for children without reference to the number of needy children (S. Rept. 1726). p. 10430

5. TAXES. Began debate on H. R. 12695, the tax rate extension bill, with discussion of the economic situation. pp. 10447-79
6. WATERSHEDS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee approved watershed projects at Canoe Creek, Ky., and Wild Rice Creek, N. D. and S. D. p. D558
7. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Neuberger inserted an article, "Outside Chance Seen for Halting Federal Transportation Excises." pp. 10445-6  
Sen. Smathers inserted a statement by the American Trucking Ass'n asserting that the highway users were paying more than their fair share for the construction of highways. pp. 10480-3
8. STATEHOOD. Sen. Church inserted an editorial urging statehood for Alaska. p. 10479
9. TEXTILES. Sen. Thurmond urged quota limitations on the importation of types of textile goods from abroad. pp. 10479-80
10. VEGETABLES. Sen. Yarborough commended the 1959 Senate salad, which included shrimp, escarole, and green onions from Texas, and concluded that "Texas farmers and fishermen produce virtually every ingredient for delicious salad." p. 10483
11. PERSONNEL ETHICS. Sen. Morse inserted an editorial, "On Setting An Example," and discussed the ethics of the administration. pp. 10483-5
12. RECLAMATION. Both Houses received from the Interior Department notice that an adequate soil survey and land classification had been made of the Crooked River project, Ore., and that these lands may be irrigated. pp. 10429, 10536  
Both Houses received reports from the Interior Department of two project proposals under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, in Geortetown, Calif., and East Nicolaus, Calif. pp. 10429, 10536

#### HOUSE

13. PERSONNEL. A subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported with amendment S. 385, to authorize the training of Federal employees at public or private facilities. p. D561
14. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendment H. R. 12832, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system (H. Rept. 1922). p. 10537  
A subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 8742, to provide a 2-year statute of limitations on actions involving transportation of property and passengers of the U. S. Government. p. D561
15. FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 3, to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. p. 10537
16. SURPLUS PROPERTY. The Government Operations Committee reported with amendment S. 2752, to modify procedures for submitting proposed surplus property disposals to the Attorney General (H. Rept. 1920). p. 10537



## SUCKER TOBACCO

---

JUNE 18, 1958.—Ordered to be printed

---

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted the following

## REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 11058]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11058) to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

Briefly, the bill would discourage the harvesting and marketing of a "sucker crop" by providing that if in any calendar year more than 1 crop of tobacco is grown from either the same tobacco plants or different tobacco plants from the same tobacco acreage, the acreage allotment next established for the farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than 1 crop of tobacco was grown and harvested.

A fuller explanation of the bill is set out in the attached report of the House Committee on Agriculture.

---

[H. Rept. No. 1506, 85th Cong., 2d sess.]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11058) to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

## STATEMENT

When tobacco is transplanted early in the spring, has favorable growing conditions, matures and is harvested early, and favorable growing conditions continue until late into the fall, some farmers are able to harvest a second crop of tobacco from the same acreage. This second picking is usually called a "sucker crop."

Previous to 1957 these conditions had occurred only in relatively isolated instances. The volume of tobacco which was added to the market by this second crop was not considered of any significance.

In 1957, however, growing conditions were so favorable in a large portion of the Burley Belt that a substantially larger acreage of "suckers" was harvested. It has been estimated that from 5 million to 15 million pounds of burley "suckers" were harvested and marketed last year. This contributes to the present supply of burley tobacco, of course, and will be taken into consideration in exstablishing marketing quotas and acreage allotments for the next season.

This bill would discourage the harvesting and marketing of a "sucker crop" by providing that if in any calendar year more than one crop of tobacco is grown from either the same tobacco plants or different tobacco plants from the same tobacco acreage, the acreage allotment next established for the farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco was grown and harvested.

#### DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL

Technicians from the Department of Agriculture, in discussing the proposed legislation with the Tobacco Subcommittee, were strongly in favor of the enactment of the bill. The formal report of the Department of Agriculture, quoted below, indicates that it has no objection to the passage of the bill.

MARCH 10, 1958.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,  
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,  
House of Representatives.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: This is in reply to your request of March 4, 1958, for a report on H. R. 11058, a bill to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments.

This Department has no objection to the passage of the bill.

The bill amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide that in the event a second crop of tobacco is harvested for marketing from the same acreage, the allotment next established for such farm shall be reduced by the acreage from which a second crop is harvested.

The 1957 crop of burley tobacco was transplanted early, had favorable growing conditions, matured and was harvested early in some areas. With continued favorable growing conditions and a late fall, some farmers were able to harvest a second crop of tobacco from their allotted acreages. This second crop is commonly called "suckers." Although this has happened before in isolated instances, it has not heretofore been considered as contributing any significant quantity to the total supply of burley tobacco. However, due to the favorable growing season existing in some sections of the burley area in 1957, substantially larger acreages of "suckers" were harvested. It has been variously estimated that from 5 million to 15 million pounds of burley "suckers" were harvested and marketed last year. This has contributed to the present surplus of burley tobacco. It appears reasonable to expect this problem will become more acute in the future.

"Suckers" cannot always be distinguished on the warehouse floor, but are significantly different from a chemical and flavor standpoint and are of inferior quality. Although the practice could apply to all kinds of tobacco, it has heretofore been limited primarily to purely tobacco.

The enactment of this bill will have no significant effect on expenditure of administrative or CCC capital funds.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,  
*Acting Secretary.*

#### CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (new matter is printed in *italic*, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

#### AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

##### SEC. 313. \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Secretary on the basis of average yield per acre of tobacco for the State during the five years last preceding the year in which the national marketing quota is proclaimed, adjusted for abnormal conditions of production, may convert the State marketing quota into a State acreage allotment, and allot the same through the local committees among farms on the basis of the factors set forth in subsection (b), using past acreage (harvested and diverted) in lieu of the past marketing of tobacco; and the Secretary on the basis of the national average yield during the same period, similarly adjusted, may also convert into an acreage allotment the amount reserved from the national quota pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c), and on the basis of the factors set forth in subsection (c) and the past tobacco experience of the farm operator, allot the same through the local committees among farms on which no tobacco was produced during the last five years. Except for farms last mentioned or a farm operated, controlled or directed by a person who also operates, controls, or directs another farm on which tobacco is produced, the farm-acreage allotment shall be increased by the smaller of (1) 20 per centum of such allotment or (2) the percentage by which the normal yield of such allotment (as determined through the local committees in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary) is less than three thousand two hundred pounds, in the case of flue-cured tobacco, and two thousand four hundred pounds in the case of other kinds of tobacco: *Provided*, That the normal yield of the estimated number of acres so added to farm acreage allotments in any State shall be considered as a part of the State marketing quota in applying the proviso in subsection (a). The actual production of the acreage allotment established for a farm pursuant to this subsection shall be the amount of the farm marketing quota. If any amount of tobacco shall be marketed as having been

produced on the acreage allotment for any farm which in fact was produced on a different farm, the acreage allotments next established for both such farms shall be reduced by that percentage which such amount was of the respective farm marketing quota, except that such reduction for any such farm shall not be made if the Secretary through the local committees finds that no person connected with such farm caused, aided, or acquiesced in such marketing; and if proof of the disposition of any amount of tobacco is not furnished as required by the Secretary, the acreage allotment next established for the farm on which such tobacco is produced shall be reduced by a percentage similarly computed. *If in any calendar year more than one crop of tobacco is grown from (1) the same tobacco plants or (2) different tobacco plants, and is harvested for marketing from the same acreage of a farm, the acreage allotment next established for such farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco has been so grown and harvested.*





Calendar No. 1760

85TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

# H. R. 11058

[Report No. 1725]

---

## IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 22, 1958

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

JUNE 18, 1958

Reported by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, without amendment

---

## AN ACT

To amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments.

1        *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2        *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3        That section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act  
4        of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end  
5        thereof the following new sentence: "If in any calendar year  
6        more than one crop of tobacco is grown from (1) the same  
7        tobacco plants or (2) different tobacco plants, and is har-  
8        vested for marketing from the same acreage of a farm, the  
9        acreage allotment next established for such farm shall be  
10       reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which  
11       more than one crop of tobacco has been so grown and  
12       harvested."

- 1 SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become  
 2 effective beginning with the 1958 crop of tobacco.

Passed the House of Representatives April 21, 1958.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

*Clerk.*

Calendar No. 1760

85TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

**H. R. 11058**

[Report No. 1725]

## AN ACT

To amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments.

APRIL 22, 1958

Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Agriculture and Forestry

JUNE 18, 1958

Reported without amendment







11. COTTON. Passed without amendment H. R. 11399, to authorize the Secretary to set the levels of price support for extra long-staple cotton at between 60 to 75 percent of parity. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 10765
12. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Passed without amendment H. R. 10969 (in place of a similar bill S. 3323), to extend the Defense Production Act for 2 years until June 30, 1960. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 10773-4
13. LIVESTOCK LOANS. Passed as reported H. R. 11424, to extend for 2 years, through July 14, 1961, the authority of the Secretary to extend or make supplementary advances to borrowers for special livestock loans. p. 10780
14. TOBACCO. Passed without amendment H. R. 11058, to reduce the acreage allotments of tobacco farmers who harvest more than one crop of tobacco in a year from the same acreage. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 10780
15. NATURAL RESOURCES. Passed as reported S. 2517, to authorize the States to choose mineral lands in making selections in lieu of sections of public lands occupied before State claims were made. pp. 10781-3
16. SURPLUS FOODS. Passed without amendment H. R. 12164, to permit the donation of surplus foods to nonprofit summer camps for children without regard to the number of needy children actually enrolled. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 10780
17. INSPECTION SERVICES. Passed without amendment S. 3873, to authorize the interchange of inspection services between executive agencies without reimbursement or transfer of funds. p. 10769
18. PROPERTY. Passed as reported S. 3142, to authorize the lease of Federal building sites until needed for actual construction. p. 10769
19. TRANSPORTATION. Passed as reported S. Res 303, to provide for a study of transportation policies in the United States by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, including the exemption provisions in the laws regulating transportation. p. 10773
20. MONOPOLIES. The Judiciary Committee ordered reported with amendment S. 11, to amend the Robinson-Patman Act to make price discrimination prima facie proof of violation of the law. p. D578
21. STATEHOOD. Began debate on H. R. 7999, to admit Alaska as a State. pp. 10766, 10786, 10803, 10804, 10804-10.
22. INFORMATION. At the request of Sen. Talmadge, passed over S. 921, to restrict the right of Federal officers to withhold information or records. p. 10765.
23. WATERSHEDS. At the request of Sen. Hruska, passed over H. R. 5497, to authorize Federal assistance for certain fish and wildlife development projects under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. p. 10765
24. ONION FUTURES. At the request of Sen. Hruska, passed over H. R. 376, to prohibit trading in onion futures on commodity exchanges. p. 10765

25. FARMER COMMITTEES. At the request of Sen. Talmadge, passed over S. 1436, to amend various provisions of law regarding ASC committees, to provide for the administration of the farm program by farmer elected committees, etc. p. 10766
26. BUILDINGS. At the request of Sen. Hruska, passed over S. 3560, to authorize construction of a \$20 million Federal building in Memphis, Tenn. p. 10766
27. TEXTILES. At the request of Sen. Talmadge, passed over H. R. 469, to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products. pp. 10766-7
28. MINERALS. At the request of Sen. Mansfield, passed over S. 3817, to encourage exploration for minerals with Federal aid. p. 10769
29. TRANSPORTATION. At the request of Sens. Talmadge and Hruska, passed over S. 3916, to extend for two years provisions of the Shipping Act of 1916 to allow continuation of existing dual-rate contract agreements. p. 10774
30. SMALL BUSINESS. At the request of Sen. Clark, passed over H. R. 7963, to extend the Small Business Act of 1953, and increase the SBA loan authority. p. 10775
31. REORGANIZATION. At the request of Sen. Talmadge, passed over S. Res. 297, to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958, to merge the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Federal Civil Defense Administration. p. 10776  
Sen. Potter commended the adverse report of the Government Operations Committee on S. Res. 297, and the evaluation of the proposed merger. p. 10802
32. HUMANE SLAUGHTER. At the request of Sen. Talmadge, passed over H. R. 8308, to require the use of humane methods in the slaughter of livestock and poultry. p. 10780
33. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Thurmond submitted amendments to H. R. 12591, the trade agreements extension bill, proposing to limit the extension to 2 years and to require Congressional assent to Presidential action reversing findings of the Tariff Commission. p. 10804
34. EXTENSION. Sen. Johnston inserted an editorial on the death of Dr. F. Franklin Poole, President of Clemson College, S. C. pp. 10783-4
35. RECLAMATION. Received from the Interior Department a report that the Bountiful, Utah, Water Subconservancy District, had applied for a loan of \$3,510,000, under the Small Reclamation Projects Act. p. 10747

#### ITEMS IN APPENDIX

36. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Green inserted an article, "Over \$63 Million in Foreign Aid Shared by Eight Oregon Communities." pp. A5696-7
37. COTTON. Extension of remarks of Sen. Sparkman urging aid for cotton farmers and inserting an article, "Cotton's Decline, Long Foreseen, Still Pains Many Dixie Farmers--Some Quit, Wind Up On City Relief Rolls; Others Find Pinch Profits Harder." pp. A5697-8
38. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Extension of remarks of Sen. Proxmire inserting 2 Grange organization resolutions in support of his bill, S. 2952. p. A5698



operation, and maintenance of artificial works for conducting water thereto as is required for the reclamation by the State of Florida or any political subdivision thereof or any drainage district organized under its laws of lands lying easterly of the eastern boundary of the park in township 54 south, ranges 31 and 32 east, township 55 south, ranges 32 and 33 east, and township 56 south, range 33 east. He shall grant said permission, however, only after a master plan for the drainage of said lands has been approved by the State of Florida and after finding that the approved plan has engineering feasibility and is so designed as to minimize disruptions of the natural state of the park. Any right-of-way granted pursuant to this section shall be revocable upon breach of the conditions upon which it is granted, which conditions shall also be enforceable in any other appropriate manner, and the grantee shall be obligated to remove its improvements and to restore the land occupied by it to its previous condition in the event of such revocation.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to transfer to the State of Florida by quitclaim deed the land, water, and interests therein, previously acquired by the United States of America for Everglades National Park and not included within such park by section 1 of this act, such transfer to be in exchange for the conveyance by the State of Florida to the United States of all land, water, and interests therein, owned by the State within the boundary of the park as described in section 1 of this act: *Provided*, That exclusion of any land, water, and interests therein from the park boundary pursuant to section 1 of this act shall be dependent upon the contemporaneous conveyance by the State to the United States of all land, water, and interests therein, owned by the State within the park boundary described in section 1 of this act, including land, water, and interests therein, heretofore conveyed to the State for transfer to the United States for inclusion in Everglades National Park. The effectuation of the transfer provided for in this section shall be a condition precedent to the acquisition by the Secretary of any land, water, or interests therein held in private ownership within the boundaries set forth in section 1 of this act and outside the area designated in the act of October 10, 1949, except as such acquisition is by donation.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than \$2 million in all, as are required for the acquisition of land, water, and interests therein held in private ownership within the boundaries of Everglades National Park as fixed by section 1 of this act and outside the area described in the act of October 10, 1949.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have only one question. I recall that for some time this bill has languished, either in the House or Senate. Some opposition developed because there were holders for value in this general area who had been doing some prospecting for mineral and oil resources. My information is that they are amply safeguarded in the bill, so I raise the question only for the purpose of eliciting any statement which the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] or the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] may wish to make on that point.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wyoming if he desires to make a statement, although I am prepared to answer the question of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know of no one better qualified to make a statement on the bill than is the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

The question did arise, as correctly stated by the Senator from Illinois, as to the length of time granted to owners of private properties which are to be brought within the park by this particular bill, for exploration of oil and minerals, and the time for production of oil and minerals, if any be discovered.

The committee decided, in its wisdom—and the two Senators from Florida, along with their colleagues from the House concerned with this matter, agreed with the committee—that the point was well taken, and that more time should be allowed. So if the distinguished Senator will look at pages 17 and 18 of the bill as reported, he will find that all owners were allowed until October 9, 1967, for exploration.

In the event that, by that date, any oil or other minerals should be discovered, they are allowed until such time as production shall be accomplished, for the removal of such oils and minerals.

The Senator will find another, still more ample, provision in the bill. I refer to subparagraph (3), on page 18, on line 15, which I shall read into the RECORD to give even further assurance than that already stated:

(3) After the termination of the reserved rights of owners as set forth in subsections (1) and (2) of this section, a further reservation of the right to customary royalties, applying at the time of production, in any oil, gas or other minerals which may be produced from such land and water at any time before January 1, 1985, should production ever be authorized by the Federal Government or its assigns.

The committee report shows that the allowance made to owners under the amended provisions of the bill is unusually generous—as I believe to be the case.

For the information of the Senate, the committee has very carefully studied this subject, and has found—which I know to be true—that all the conservation groups in the country are agreeable to the passage of the bill, even though, as an unprecedented thing, it would permit an elimination of nearly 800,000 acres from the originally authorized park. However, none of the original objectives of the park will be harmed, or these great conservation groups would not have agreed to the passage of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I deem that an adequate safeguard, and I have no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend from Illinois.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senate committee added an amendment with respect to the character of the regulations to be written by the National Park Service. The regulations were designed, and the bill was introduced, to protect the land within the park. The bill was amended in committee so as to include protection

of the rights granted to those who held mineral reservations. I am happy to say that that amendment, written in to the bill by the Senate committee, has today been adopted by the House.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, while I wish the bill to pass, and hope it will, I desire to inform the Senate that a few minutes ago the House passed a companion bill with the identical Senate amendments included. When it comes over to the Senate I shall ask unanimous consent to revert to this item and pass the House bill. For the present, I ask that the Senate bill, as amended, be considered and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HOLLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recur to Senate bill 1790, which passed on the call of the calendar, in order that I may request the present consideration of House bill 6641, passed today, which is a bill on the same subject, and containing the identical language of the Senate committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida explained the situation earlier this afternoon. I understand that the House has passed a bill with the identical language of the Senate amendments, and the Senator from Florida merely wishes to have the Senate pass the House bill and indefinitely postpone consideration of the Senate bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct. Rather than have the House bill come here and the Senate bill go to the House, it seems to me that the appropriate thing to do is to pass the House bill and indefinitely postpone the Senate bill, which was passed earlier in the day, with the explanation that the Senate had just been informed that the House had acted and adopted language of the Senate committee amendments, but that a little time would be required to prepare the message.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which Senate bill 1790 was passed on the call of the calendar be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. I now ask for the present consideration of House bill 6641.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The bill (H. R. 6641), to fix the boundary of Everglades National Park, Fla., to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire land therein, and to provide for the transfer of certain land not included within said boundary,



and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 6641?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1790 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Presiding Officer and the acting majority leader. I understand that all this had been agreed upon previously by the majority and minority leaders.

#### EXTENSION OF SPECIAL LIVESTOCK LOANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 11424) to extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to extend special livestock loans, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "(12 U. S. C. 114 8a (c))" and insert "(12 U. S. C. 1148a-2 (c))."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 8308), to establish the use of humane methods of slaughter of livestock as a policy of the United States, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. I ask that the bill be passed over, because it is not appropriate for consideration on a call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### TOBACCO ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The bill (H. R. 11058) to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER

H. R. 11058 is identical to S. 3380, which I introduced in the Senate for myself and my colleague, Senator MORTON.

H. H. 11058 was introduced in the House by my colleague from Kentucky, Representative JOHN WATTS. As it has passed the House by a unanimous vote it is substituted for S. 3380.

The bill has now been approved unanimously by the Senate Agriculture Committee and I ask that the Senate pass the bill.

Its purpose is to carry out the spirit and, I am sure, the intent of the tobacco price support and production control program. Its passage is necessary because a limited number of tobacco growers have followed the practice of selling a second crop of inferior

tobacco—termed "sucker" tobacco, from the same acreage allotment which had produced a first crop of tobacco. The bill would discourage and, I hope, end this practice by reducing the next allotment by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco was grown and harvested.

The bill has the support of farm organizations and tobacco farmers themselves. In fact, I know of no opposition to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON—EXPLANATION OF H. R. 11058

The purpose of this bill is to discourage the harvesting and marketing of a sucker crop by providing that if in any calendar year more than one crop of tobacco is grown from either the same tobacco plants or different tobacco plants from the same tobacco acreage, the acreage allotment next established for the farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco was grown and harvested. When tobacco is transplanted early in the spring, has favorable growing conditions, matures and is harvested early, and favorable growing conditions continue until late in the fall, some farmers are able to harvest a second crop of tobacco from the same acreage. This second picking is usually called a "sucker crop." Prior to 1957 these conditions occurred only in relatively isolated instances. The volume of tobacco which was added to the market by these two crops was not considered of any significance.

In 1957, however, growing conditions were so favorable in a large portion of the burley belt that a substantially larger acreage of suckers was harvested. It has been established that from 5 to 15 million pounds of burley suckers were harvested and marketed last year. This contributes to the present supply of burley tobacco, and will be taken into consideration in establishing marketing quotas and acreage allotments for the next season.

This bill would discourage the harvesting and marketing of a sucker crop by penalizing the individual, rather than by distributing the penalty among all farmers.

#### USE OF SURPLUS FOODS IN NON-PROFIT SUMMER CAMPS FOR CHILDREN

The bill (H. R. 12164) to permit use of Federal surplus foods in nonprofit summer camps for children was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON—EXPLANATION OF H. R. 12164

The purpose of this bill is to clarify the law relating to the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to donate surplus food commodities to nonprofit children's summer camps. Under existing provisions of law nonprofit school lunch programs are eligible to receive surplus food commodities and the Department has been following the general policy that nonprofit summer camps are an extension of the school activity and there-

fore should also be eligible to receive surplus foods. This bill would leave no doubt that summer camps for children which are operated on a nonprofit basis have the same sort of eligibility to receive surplus foods as do nonprofit school lunch programs.

The Department reports that under current donation authorities nonprofit school lunch programs are eligible to receive surplus commodities on the basis of the total number of children eating in the lunchroom while nonprofit institutions are eligible to receive such foods only to the extent of the number of needy persons served by the institutions. Nonprofit summer camps for children have been obtaining surplus foods on the basis of the total number of children in the camp under the assumption that all of these children were eligible by virtue of their eligibility under the school lunch program during the school term.

Since nonprofit summer camps for children are not specifically mentioned in the statutes and since it is questionable whether a large number of such camps can properly be classed as a summer extension of such operations, it may become necessary that such camps be classified within the other institutional category. This would result in such camps receiving surplus foods only to the extent that they can demonstrate that needy children are being served.

The same children that attend the schools are in attendance at the camps. Many charitable, welfare, and other social organizations conduct these camps, including civic groups, 4-H clubs, YMCA, YWCA, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, etc.

The committee believes that nonprofit summer camps for children should be treated in the same manner as nonprofit school lunch programs.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 332) relative to the establishment of plans for the peaceful exploration of outer space was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask that the concurrent resolution be passed over, because it is not appropriate for consideration on the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be passed over.

#### BOSTON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES COMMISSION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 12088) extending the time in which the Boston National Historic Sites Commission shall complete its work, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, after the word "years," where it appears the second time, to insert "Section 5 of the aforesaid joint resolution, as amended, is further amended by striking out '\$40,000' and by inserting in lieu thereof '\$60,000'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

#### ARCH HURLEY-TUCUMCARI RECLAMATION PROJECT, NEW MEXICO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3469) to amend the act of July







Public Law 85-489  
85th Congress, H. R. 11058  
July 2, 1958

AN ACT

72 Stat. 291.

To amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If in any calendar year more than one crop of tobacco is grown from (1) the same tobacco plants or (2) different tobacco plants, and is harvested for marketing from the same acreage of a farm, the acreage allotment next established for such farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco has been so grown and harvested." Tobacco  
acreage  
allotments.  
53 Stat. 1261.  
7 USC 1313.

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective beginning with the 1958 crop of tobacco. Effective  
date.

Approved July 2, 1958.

